

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME V.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER XXIX.

MAY, 1886

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. LIBERAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY. <i>J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D. D.</i> . . . .	453
2. THE LIFE OF WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. <i>Truman M. Post, D. D.</i> . . . .	476
3. A STURDY CHRISTIAN. <i>Henry F. van Dyke, Jr., D. D.</i> . . . .	490
4. THE POSSIBILITIES OF RELIGIOUS REFORM IN ITALY . . . . .	497
III. The Catholic Reformation of the Church. <i>Wm. Chauncy Langdon, D. D.</i>	
5. EDITORIAL.	
Is the Orthodox Pulpit Orthodox? . . . . .	517
The Inconsistency of the Liberal Opposition to Home Rule . . . . .	525
The Centralization of Labor . . . . .	529
John B. Gough : The Master of Dramatic Eloquence . . . . .	533
6. BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM . . . . .	542
The Battle of Haldûle, 691 B. C. <i>Professor Haupt.</i>	
7. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES . . . . .	547
Sir Henry Maine's Popular Government. — Abbot's Scientific Theism. — Tolstoi's My Religion. — Petrie's Tanis. Part I. — Andrews's God's Revelations of Himself to Men. — Communication from Rev. Dr. H. C. Trumbull. — Reply by Rev. E. G. Vittum.	
8. BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .	563

BOSTON  
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge*

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO, WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

# American Commonwealths.

A Series of  
Historical  
Studies.



Edited by  
Horace E.  
Scudder.

## I. Virginia.

A History of the People. By JOHN ESTEN COOKE, author of "Life of Stonewall Jackson," etc.

Mr. Cooke has made a fascinating volume, — one which it will be very difficult to surpass either in method or interest. . . . True historic insight appears through all these pages, and an earnest desire to do all parties and religions perfect justice. The story of the settlement of Virginia is told in full. . . . It is made as interesting as a romance. — *The Critic* (New York).

## II. Oregon.

The Struggle for Possession. By WILLIAM BARROWS, D. D.

The interesting story of the struggle of five nations for the possession of Oregon is told in the graphic and reliable narrative of William Barrows. . . . A more fascinating record has seldom been written. . . . Careful research and pictorial skill of narrative commend this book to all interested in the wonderful development of our American civilization upon the Pacific coast. — *Springfield Republican*.

## III. Maryland.

The History of a Palatinate. By WILLIAM HAND BROWNE, Associate of Johns Hopkins University.

With great care and labor he has sought out and studied original documents. By the aid of these he is able to give his work a value and interest that would have been impossible had he followed slavishly the commonly accepted authorities on his subject. His investigation in regard to toleration in Maryland is particularly noticeable. — *New York Evening Post*.

## VII. California. (A NEW VOLUME.)

From the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco. A Study of American Character. By JOSIAH ROYCE, Instructor in Philosophy in Harvard University, formerly Professor in the University of California, and author of "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy."

IN PREPARATION.

## Connecticut.

By Professor ALEXANDER JOHNSTON, author of "American Politics."

## South Carolina.

By the Hon. WILLIAM H. TRESCOT, author of "The Diplomacy of the American Revolution."

## Massachusetts.

By BROOKS ADAMS.

## Tennessee.

By JAMES PHELAN, Ph. D. (Leipsic).

Others to be announced hereafter. Each volume, with Map, 16mo, gilt top, \$1.25.

\* \* \* For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

4 PARK STREET, BOSTON; 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK.

## IV. Kentucky.

A Pioneer Commonwealth. By NATHANIEL S. SHALER, S. D., Professor of Palæontology, Harvard University, recently Director of the Kentucky State Survey.

Professor Shaler has prepared a succinct, well-balanced, and readable sketch of this "Pioneer Commonwealth." Himself a native of Kentucky, he writes with the natural affection which a man of loyal impulses feels for his State, and yet with no apparent bias. — *Boston Journal*.

## V. Michigan.

A History of Governments. By THOMAS M. COOLEY, LL. D., Chief Justice of Michigan.

An ably written and charmingly interesting volume. . . . For variety of incident, for transitions in experience, for importance of events, and for brilliancy and ability in the service of the leading actors, the history of Michigan offers rare attractions; and the writer of it has brought to his task the most excellent gifts and powers as a vigorous, impartial, and thoroughly accomplished historian. — *Christian Register* (Boston).

## VI. Kansas.

The Prelude to the War for the Union. By LEVERETT W. SPRING, Professor in the University of Kansas.

In all respects one of the very best of the series. . . . His work exhibits diligent research, discrimination in the selection of materials, and skill in combining his chosen stuff into a narration that has unity, and order, and lucidity. It is an excellent presentation of the important aspects and vital principles of the Kansas struggle. — *Hartford Courant*.

## Pennsylvania.

By the Hon. WAYNE McVEAGH, late Attorney-General of the United States.

## New York.

By the Hon. ELLIS H. ROBERTS, author of "Government Revenue."

## Missouri.

By LUCIEN CARR, M. A., Assistant Curator of the Peabody Museum of Archæology.

## Ohio.

By Hon. RUFUS KING.

er.

NIEL  
ogy.  
the

nced,  
th.  
tural  
State,

M.  
n.

, for  
n the  
offers  
task  
rtial,  
egis-

By  
Uni-

the  
stuff  
It  
and  
and.

y of  
for-  
los-

ney-

of

of





# CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS' NEW BOOKS.

**GERMAN PSYCHOLOGY OF TO-DAY: The Empirical School.** By TH. RIBOT, Director of the *Revue Philosophique*. Translated from the French by JAMES MARK BALDWIN, B. A. With Preface by JAMES MCCOSH, D. D. 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.00.

*Extract from President McCosh's Preface.*

American and English students will be grateful to have M. Ribot's valuable work in their own tongue by a competent translator. It contains the combined results of careful observations, experiments, and calculations which cannot be obtained otherwise except by reading innumerable books and monographs most difficult to collect. His interpretations and criticisms also are original and profound.

**PERSIA: The Land of the Imams.** By JAMES BASSETT, late missionary to Persia. 1 vol. 12mo, \$1.50.

Mr. Bassett's very readable and very thorough volume has a timely as well as a permanent interest. Long residence in the country admirably qualified him to give such an account of Persia as would meet the needs of Western readers who desire to be fully informed by a competent observer.

**THE EPIC SONGS OF RUSSIA.** By ISABEL FLORENCE HAPGOOD. With an Introductory Note by Prof. FRANCIS J. CHILD. 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.50, net.

Miss Hapgood's book opens to English readers an entirely new mythology, and lays before them a series of tales so fresh, wild, and fantastic that they will prove to be as much of a novelty as the Eastern stories were when first put into English. To students of folk-lore and literary history their value cannot be overestimated. They present a new national literature, and at a time when the interest in all things Russian is specially acute.

**LABOR, LAND, AND LAW.** A Search for the Missing Wealth of the Working Poor. By W. A. PHILLIPS, Member of Committee on Public Lands, Forty-third Congress; and on Banking and Currency, Forty-fifth Congress. 1 vol. 12mo, \$2.50.

Col. Phillips discusses the timely questions involving the general rights of labor, and the various forms of land-holding, and the origin and growth of those individual and family rights which have left their marks on our social system. He writes with great force and vigor, and this volume commends itself to all thoughtful readers and students of the questions of the day.

**MOVEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN BRITAIN DURING the Nineteenth Century.** By JOHN TULLOCH, D. D. New and cheaper edition. 1 vol. 12mo, \$1.00.

**AMERICAN DIPLOMACY: And the Furtherance of Commerce.** By Hon. EUGENE SCHUYLER, author of "Peter the Great," etc., etc. 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.50.

A very interesting and an unusually valuable book . . . which should be in the hands of every intelligent student of our government. — *New York Times*.

**LETTERS TO DEAD AUTHORS.** By ANDREW LANG. 1 vol. Elzevir 16mo, gilt top, \$1.00.

Wit, tenderness, delicacy, and discerning criticism are combined in an unusual degree, and the letters, taken as a group, constitute one of the freshest and most pleasing series of literary essays printed for many a day. — *Boston Journal*.

The strongest religious quarterly in America. — *Boston Herald*.

**THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.** Published quarterly. Annual subscription, \$3.00; single copies, 80 cents. *A strong number for April.*

**THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE; A PROOF OF ITS DIVINE ORIGIN.** By Prof. Herrick Johnson, D. D.

**THE SALVATION ARMY.** By Rev. Donald Fraser, D. D.

**THE CRITICS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By Prof. W. Henry Green, D. D.

**OF THE UNITIES OF MEDITATION.** By Prof. Edward D. Morris, D. D.

**THE REORGANIZATION OF CHRISTIAN GIVING.** By the Rev. Alfred Yeomans, D. D.

**THE HITTITES.** By Prof. Francis Brown, D. D.

**CRITICAL NOTES.**

**EDITORIAL NOTES ON TIMELY TOPICS.**

**REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE.**

\*.\* For sale by all Booksellers, or sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by

**CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, Publishers,**  
743 and 745 Broadway, New York.

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW:

*A Monthly Magazine of Religion, Theology, Social Science, and Literature.*

EDITED BY

EGBERT C. SMYTH, WILLIAM J. TUCKER, J. W. CHURCHILL,  
GEORGE HARRIS, EDWARD Y. HINCKS,

*Professors in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., with the  
coöperation and active support of their colleagues in the Faculty,*

*Professors JOHN P. GULLIVER, JOHN PHELPS TAYLOR,*

*GEORGE F. MOORE, and FRANK E. WOODRUFF.*

---

## THE ANDOVER REVIEW FOR 1886.

The success which has attended the publication of the ANDOVER REVIEW for the past two years has led to its establishment upon a permanent financial basis. Commencing the year 1886 with increased resources, the REVIEW will be enlarged with each monthly issue to 112 pages, making an aggregate for the year of 1344 pages, and the annual price of subscription will be \$4.00; single copies, 35 cents.

---

THE ANDOVER REVIEW is a Religious and Theological Monthly, advocating the principles and methods of what is now known as Progressive Orthodoxy, but its discussions are not confined to the field of Theology. It is already recognized "as a strong expounder of the social questions of the day, promising a future of great influence." In future, articles upon Sociology will be supplemented by a department of Sociological Notes under the charge of the Rev. S. W. DIKE.

A Geographical and Missionary Department will also be added, under the care of Rev. C. C. STARBUCK.

Educational discussions will be continued, notably that introduced by Professor Palmer, of Harvard, in the November number.

The Moral Aspects of Literary Topics will be considered in special papers.

A Series of articles upon Church Architecture, by Professor Churchill, will begin in an early number.

The Editorial and other departments will be conducted as heretofore, with increased attention to Book Reviews.

*Back numbers for 1884 and 1885 can be supplied for \$3.00 a year or the four bound volumes for \$10.00.*

*Postal Notes and Money are at the risk of the sender, and therefore remittances should be made by money-order, draft, or registered letter, to*

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

4 PARK STREET, BOSTON. MASS.

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

## NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

The Andover Review for November opens with a paper on "The New Education," by Professor Palmer, of Harvard, which is a vigorous defense. It is to be followed in the succeeding numbers with further discussions by other teachers. This is putting a review to good service. The editorial work is full, rich, and spicy as usual. — *The Independent* (New York).

People look with expectancy to the Andover Review for fresh and popular treatment of social and ethical subjects, as well as for scholarly criticisms and able handling of theological and philosophical problems. — *Christian Union* (New York).

The Review closes its first year with a record of work in the sphere of theology, philosophy, criticism, and social discussion which has never been surpassed in English periodical literature, and has made a strong impression upon the religious and thoughtful life of the whole country. Its more original articles have gone far to instruct the minds and change the opinions of the leaders of thought. — *Boston Herald*.

The Andover Review of March has a very sensible editorial article on Common School Methods. It would be useful to take this essay, convert it into a tract, and circulate it widely among teachers, parents, and Boards of Education. It certainly would give them something to think of. — *New York Observer*.

The Andover Review is maintaining the high position which it took in the religious and intellectual world with its first number. In our judgment it has no equal in the field which it occupies. — *The Advance* (Chicago).

Always liberal and progressive, it has been an honest exponent of modern religious thought, though none the less orthodox in all the essentials of Christianity. Every leading question has

been discussed, thoughtfully and ably, by some of the preëminent theological writers of the age. It not only discusses the theoretical questions that agitate the time, but is strong and practical in dealing with the great questions rising constantly in the work of the church throughout the world. — *The Daily American* (Nashville).

The first volume of the Andover Review has been, certainly, a brilliant success in the patronage it has secured, in the cordial reception it has received from both the religious and secular press, and in the ability and variety of its literary and apologetic contributions. — *Zion's Herald* (Boston).

In its thoroughly satisfactory progress, the Andover Review has become a strong expounder of social questions of the day, and promises a future of great influence. It is both earnest and thoroughly alive to current thought, and looks to the highest in morality and religion. — *Boston Journal*.

We hear no review more frequently referred to or quoted from nowadays than the Andover Review, which seems to have confronted the public mind—the thinking sides of it—in an unusual degree, and to be awakening, if not forming, public opinions on a good many important questions. — *Literary World* (Boston).

The Andover Review, for the average preacher, is the best in this country. It is versatile, up to the times, scholarly, non-sectarian, evangelical, progressive. Besides, it is a monthly; thus by its frequency making its appearance the more welcome. It always comes to hand promptly at the first of the month. — *Missionary Record* (St. Louis).

In every number we find something to be especially preserved. — *The Churchman* (New York).



GOLD MEDAL, PARIS, 1878.

**BAKER'S**

**Vanilla Chocolate,**

Like all our chocolates, is prepared with the greatest care, and consists of a superior quality of cocoa and sugar, flavored with pure vanilla bean. Served as a drink, or eaten dry as confectionery, it is a delicious article, and is highly recommended by tourists.

Sold by Grocers everywhere.

**W. BAKER & CO., Dorchester, Mass.**



GOLD MEDAL, PARIS, 1878.

**BAKER'S**

**Breakfast Cocoa.**

Warranted absolutely pure Cocoa, from which the excess of Oil has been removed. It has three times the strength of Cocoa mixed with Starch, Arrowroot or Sugar, and is therefore far more economical, costing less than one cent a cup. It is delicious, nourishing, strengthening, easily digested, and admirably adapted for invalids as well as for persons in health.

Sold by Grocers everywhere.

**W. BAKER & CO., Dorchester, Mass.**

If you want the Best Writing Paper and Envelopes for Correspondence and all the uses of Polite Society, ask your Stationer for

**"WHITING'S STANDARD,"**

made by Whiting Paper Co., Holyoke, Mass. These goods are the most perfect product of the Paper-maker's art. Cream and azure; rough and smooth finish; all sizes.

## The Christian Register,

A FAMILY AND RELIGIOUS NEWSPAPER.

Established 1821.

### WHAT THEY SAY OF IT.

FROM A BAPTIST MINISTER.—"It is more than worth the price of subscription."

A BUST PHYSICIAN.—"I wish to testify to the benefit I have derived from the columns of the *Register* within the past year. Its reading matter is always valuable and interesting. It is one of the best papers found on my table."

FROM A QUAKER LADY.—"I like thy paper very much, especially the children's department. I consider it a high-toned paper, touching as it does on all important topics concerning Christianity. I hope it may have a still wider circulation."

AN ORTHODOX SHEPHERD says: "I am enjoying the *Register* more and more each week. The tone of your paper is such that it has given me a new idea of the much-abused term 'Liberalism.' A *divine* liberality is what the world needs as much as anything."

AN EPISCOPALIAN MINISTER.—"The *Christian Register*, during its grand career of more than sixty years, must have been a mighty agent in diffusing that light; and may its sphere of usefulness ever extend and continue. I always look anxiously forward for it every alternate Monday, and sit up till twelve o'clock and past in the evening poring over it and devouring its contents."

**TERMS: THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.**

Sample Copies sent free for four weeks on application to the Publishers,

**CHRISTIAN REGISTER ASSOCIATION,**  
141 Franklin Street, Boston.

## BALZAC IN ENGLISH.

The time should now be ripe for the introduction of English-speaking people to an author who by right of genius stands alone among his contemporaries. . . . There ought to be in the United States and England, at the present time, enough lovers of good literature to make such an undertaking as a complete translation of this author remunerative. — *New York Tribune*.

The announcement of a series of new translations of some of Balzac's leading novels has awakened a good deal of interest among those who are familiar with the masterpieces of this great delineator of modern life. The *Comédie Humaine* remains unquestionably the greatest literary undertaking of modern times; such a task as only the strongest could set before himself and achieve even in a very small measure. That Balzac carried his scheme so far, touched life on so many sides, and portrayed with such marvelous reality so many of its most significant phases, is impressive evidence, not only of his genius, but of his marvelous working power. In this day of more delicate but lighter and far less substantial work in fiction the re-reading of Balzac might well serve as a tonic. And for this reason we are glad to note the announcement of this series of fresh translations. — *N. Y. Christian Union*.

**PÈRE GORIOT.** The first volume in Roberts Brothers' series of Balzac's Novels, newly translated into English, elicits the following tribute: "St. Augustine, Florida. Gentlemen: Although a stranger to you, I cannot refrain from returning to you the heartfelt thanks always due in courtesy those who have, consciously or not, given extreme pleasure. In the publication of 'Père Goriot' you have rendered thousands of readers an almost priceless service, and I most earnestly trust that the reception of the effort you have made will be so instantaneous and widespread as to encourage you to place the world of Balzac before those unfortunate enough not to be able to enjoy it in the original. Yours gratefully, F. S. A."

**THE DUCHESSE DE Langeais.**

**CÉSAR BIROTTEAU.**

**EUGÉNIE GRANDÈT.**

Balzac's novels are in handsome 12mo volumes, neatly bound in half morocco, French style. Price, \$1.50 each. Sold by all booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price. Send for our new Descriptive Catalogue (free).

**ROBERTS BROTHERS, Publishers,**  
3 Somerset Street, Boston.

THE  
ANDOVER REVIEW:  
A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V.—MAY, 1886.—No. XXIX.

---

LIBERAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

BESIDES aiming at the general development of the mental powers, and fitting the pupils for the ordinary duties and varied special callings in life, German education is controlled by the ideas that national unity must be promoted by national culture, that existing authorities must be respected, and that the training of the individual is to fit him for consecrating his powers to the welfare of the whole people. But, aside from these fundamental aims, the various schools do not form an educational system whose parts are so articulated as to form an organism. While the unity of the elementary, intermediate, and highest schools is apparent, there are numerous other institutions which do not prepare for the highest instruction, but directly for life, or some particular calling, so that they cannot be viewed as part of an organic union. It is this heterogeneity which makes the subject of education in Germany so difficult of comprehension.

The lowest and highest schools, namely, the common school and the university, are easily understood. The former furnishes the education regarded essential for both sexes, and for every station in life, and attendance on it is compulsory. The university is annually attended by hundreds of American students, and is better known in our country than the other higher schools. The *Universitas Litterarum* aims to give the most advanced instruction in the highest departments of learning; but its division into the four Faculties of Theology, Law, Medicine, and Philosophy indicates that its aim is specific rather than general. The term "philosophy" is here used in the broad, traditional sense, which is much more comprehensive than the present technical use of the word. Thus, besides philosophy proper, the Philosophical Faculty includes the mathematical, natural, political, economical, industrial, and phi-



logical sciences, as well as history, geography, and the history and science of art. The instruction is by means of lectures; but in what are termed "seminaries" discussions are conducted by the professors. There are also numerous laboratories, clinics, and other institutes, with the best apparatus and the finest opportunities for observation and experiment, thus uniting the practical with the highest theoretical instruction. The student matriculated into a Faculty must subscribe for at least one prominent course of lectures in that Faculty, but he can also attend any other lectures in the university. In the choice of lectures, and in hearing them after subscribing, the student is perfectly free. No one keeps an account of his attendance, and the professor's relation to the students is usually such that he has but little knowledge of their faithfulness and diligence. During the entire course of three or four years there are no examinations; but at the end of each semester the student may get a certificate of attendance from the professor for whose lectures he has subscribed; for his knowledge of the matter, however, the professor generally depends on the statement of the student himself. The test of diligence and scholarship comes when the student applies for a degree, or wants to enter a profession, or occupy any other position which requires graduation from a university. These examinations serve as goads to diligence where the love of study is wanting.

The Philosophical Faculty furnishes opportunities for the highest liberal culture, similar to a post-graduate course in America, though generally of a higher grade; but the students at the university have special spheres in view, and the demands on them are such that they concentrate their energies on direct preparation for a particular calling. Professor Paulsen, of Berlin, complains that even this Faculty has become "*Fachschule*," being frequented mainly by those preparing to become teachers in the higher schools. Students of medicine and law are rarely seen in the lecture-rooms of this Faculty; those of theology more frequently, but they, too, need their strength for special studies. The German university, therefore, must not be identified with an American college or university; it is more correct to say that the latter prepares for the instruction imparted in a German university. The cases are not rare in which graduates, and even instructors, from our institutions find themselves but poorly prepared for the lectures here delivered.

As we have no institution which Germany would recognize as a university, so the Germans have none exactly like our college.

There are various intermediate schools between the common school and the university, of which the one most like our college is the *Gymnasium*. If this emphasizes linguistic training more than our college, the latter aims to be more comprehensive, and includes studies which, in Germany, are assigned to the Philosophical Faculty in the university.

The question of liberal education in Germany pertains chiefly to the intermediate schools, which afford that general instruction which is the basis of the professional and all the highest special studies. There is much dispute as to what constitutes a liberal education, and what studies it requires; still we are justified in excluding from the discussion not merely the university, but also the polytechnic, industrial, agricultural, and military schools, whose aim is specific adaptation, not general culture. The High School (*höhere Bürgerschule*), with a course of six years, furnishes a more general education, but not what is termed liberal, its aim being to prepare for life and business.

The schools which here concern us are the *Gymnasium*, *Real Gymnasium*, and the *Upper Real School*.<sup>1</sup> They have a course of nine years, and pupils usually enter at the age of nine. These schools are for boys, higher institutions of learning for girls being generally left to private enterprise.

The school most universally recognized as furnishing a liberal education is the *Gymnasium*, and, until recently, it had no rival to this claim. At the close of the last century the modern *Gymnasium* grew out of what were then called Latin Schools; and even to the present that language has been the principal study. The Germans long depreciated their own language, preferring Latin for their learned works and French for polite society. Among scholars the former was a living language, being used for books, lectures, addresses, in the class-room, and at examinations, and it was studied for eloquence as well as for scholarship. During the reign of Frederick the Great more attention was directed to the contents of the classical languages, and voices were also heard against their predominance. Largely through Herder's influence, and his emphasis on *humanity*, particularly as promoted by the Greeks, the classics gained new favor as promoters of the humanistic spirit. But not till 1812 were those who desired the privileges of the university obliged to pass an examination in Greek.

<sup>1</sup> Pro-Gymnasia, Pro-Real Gymnasia, and Real Schools are the same as those in the text, except that they lack the last two years. *Real* is pronounced ray-ahl.



In 1816 the Prussian Gymnasium required that, during the last four years, there should be eight hours a week for Latin, seven for Greek, six for mathematics, four for German, and three for history and geography. Antiquity, particularly that contained in the Greek language, was regarded as the most worthy study. Owing to its perfection of form, and its literary treasures, the Greek language became very prominent, being made "part of the education of architects, officers of the post-office department, military officers, merchants, chemists, and dentists." It was ordained, in 1834, that the privileges of the university should be granted only to graduates of Gymnasias; and the need of an equal and uniform general education for the professions, and for learned and official positions in life, was emphasized. Dividing the following by nine — the number of years in the course — we get the average number of lessons a week, according to the plan adopted in 1837: Religious Instruction, 18; Latin, 86; Greek, 42; German, 22; French, 12; Mathematics, 23; Natural Science, 16; History and Geography, 24; Introduction to Philosophy, 4. In 1856 a Greek composition took the place of translations from Greek authors in the final examination; in other respects the plan remained essentially the same as that of 1837.

The present system of instruction in the Prussian intermediate schools was introduced in 1882. From the professions, from educators, and others, protests were heard against the Gymnasium, because it failed to meet the requirements of the times. Von Goslar, the Minister of Education, therefore determined to prepare a new schedule of instruction, embodying the results of past experience and of the progress made since the adoption of the plan of 1856. Besides himself, men in his department eminently qualified for the work were constantly studying the existing system; the opinions of teachers and educational authorities were also secured; and in 1873 a conference of educators was held in Berlin to discuss the needed improvements. After long and thorough investigation of the whole matter, the new plan was sent to the different educational authorities for criticism; and then, as the result of the final revision, the plan of 1882 was adopted. It was submitted to a committee of the legislature and unanimously approved. It thus received the unqualified stamp of approval on the part of the authorities, and may be regarded as an embodiment of the highest official wisdom.

While the Minister recognized the need of changes, he did not want them to be too radical. The just demands of the day and

the claims of historical development were the main points for consideration. The following official declaration indicates the spirit of the government: "The present form of our higher school system is the result of a long and manifold development, which has never been essentially hindered or determined by enactments, but has followed the tendency of the intellectual life of the nation, and has been affected by the changes of the times, without ever becoming altogether false to the original principle of the German higher schools."

The aim of the *Gymnasium* is to prepare the pupils for independent study at the university, and thus fit them for the highest duties in church and state, and for all positions of trust and scholarship. The classics are the chief studies, and most weight is attached to proficiency in them. "In harmony with the historical development, the plan of instruction in the *Gymnasium* is based on the study of the classical languages of antiquity, according to their formal and material elements; mathematics was added afterwards. The linguistic and historical study must, therefore, be regarded as the peculiar principle of the *Gymnasium*."

INSTRUCTION IN THE *GYMNASIUM*.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total.	Compared with 1856.
Religious Instruction . . . . .	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	19	-1
German . . . . .	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	21	+1
Latin . . . . .	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	77	-9
Greek . . . . .	-	-	-	7	7	7	7	6	6	40	-2
French . . . . .	-	4	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	21	+4
History and Geography . . . . .	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	28	+3
Mathematics . . . . .	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	34	+2
Natural History . . . . .	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	10	-2
Physics . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2	8	+2
Total per week <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	28	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30		

The preceding official schedule gives a complete view of the hours devoted each week to the various subjects. The nine years are divided into six classes, called — beginning with the lowest — *Sexta*, *Quinta*, *Quarta*, *Tertia*, *Secunda*, and *Prima*, of which the first three occupy a year each, the others two years each, so that we have an Upper and Lower *Tertia*, *Secunda*, and *Prima*. For these names I substitute numbers in the schedule, beginning with the lowest as number one, or the first year. Of the last two columns, the first contains the total hours, and the other indicates

<sup>1</sup> Including writing and drawing.

the increase or decrease of hours compared with the schedule of 1856. Thus, in 1882, there was an increase of one hour in German and a decrease of nine in Latin. Besides the hours noted in the schedule, two a week are devoted to gymnastics; and during the first two years two a week to singing and the same number to writing, and for the first three years two a week are also devoted to drawing.

Before 1882 a new language was begun in each of the first three years, namely, Latin, then French, and in the third year Greek. This was found too burdensome, particularly as instruction in history and mathematics also began in the second year. Greek has, consequently, been put back a year, so that it is now begun in the fourth.

In order to check the tendency to lay undue stress on the grammar, to the neglect of the contents of the ancient languages, the Greek composition for the final examination was abolished and translation from Greek authors restored. Not the formal elements of the languages but their literary treasures were to be emphasized. But a still stronger concession to the demands of modern realism was made by a decided decrease in the hours devoted to the classics and an increase in those devoted to modern languages, mathematics, natural science, and history.<sup>1</sup> These concessions are significant, because they indicate that the authorities admit that the former predominance of the classics cannot be maintained. But it is a still more significant sign of the times that the former monopoly of the Gymnasium as the means of liberal culture is seriously disputed. The rival claimant is found in the institutions termed Real.

The Real Schools originated about the middle of the last century, and owed their origin to the fact that the predominance of the classics in the Gymnasium was not regarded as the best preparation for various departments of life, although the need of the classics for a course at the university and for a learned career was not questioned. These schools have received their inspiration from the people rather than from the learned or from the fostering care of the authorities. They did not gain much prominence until this century, when they were promoted by the progress in natural science, the development of industrial pursuits, and the substitution of realism for idealism. Instead of the formal and

<sup>1</sup> Decrease in classics, 11 hours; increase in the other departments mentioned, 14. In 1856 ten hours a week were devoted to Latin during the first seven years.

theoretical, there was a demand for the material and the practical. The realistic spirit clamored for present realities, and emphasized modern languages, history, mathematics, and natural science as the means for their attainment. The culture promoted by the Gymnasium, with its preponderance of the ancient classics, was regarded as too remote from modern interests. The demand for the *real* was to be met by the Real School.

The ordinance of 1882 gave the various Real Schools their present form.<sup>1</sup> As these schools had been permitted to develop more independently than the Gymnasium, the Minister of Education found that mathematics and natural science had gained undue prominence in the second class of Real Schools (which had grown out of the various industrial schools), thus making them too exclusively technical schools (*Fachschulen*). He aimed to counteract this tendency, and to adapt them better to the general culture of the pupils. He says: "Only so far as they furnish practical proof that by limiting the instruction to modern languages the aim to give a formal linguistic and ethical training can be realized will these schools secure recognition as institutions of general culture by the side of the Gymnasium and the Real Gymnasium." The Upper Real School thus aims at general training, but its exact place is yet to be determined by the proficiency of its graduates. The following is the official schedule of

## INSTRUCTION IN THE UPPER REAL SCHOOL.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total.
Religious Instruction . . . . .	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	19
German . . . . .	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
French . . . . .	8	8	8	6	6	5	5	5	5	66
English . . . . .	-	-	-	5	5	4	4	4	4	26
History and Geography . . . . .	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	30
Mathematics . . . . .	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	49
Natural History . . . . .	2	2	2	2	2	3	-	-	-	13
Physics . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	3	3	14
Chemistry . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	3	9
Writing . . . . .	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Drawing . . . . .	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	24
Total per week . . . . .	29	29	30	30	30	32	32	32	32	

With the realistic tendencies of the day it is not surprising

<sup>1</sup> Before 1882 Real Schools were divided into two classes: the first had Latin, and was called First Class Real School; the second was called the Real School without Latin (*lateinlose Realschule*). The former is now called Real Gymnasium; the latter, Upper Real School. For this whole class of schools the term Real Schools is frequently used.

that there are those who deny that the ability to read the ancient classics in the original is an indispensable requisite for a liberal education. Although the *Gymnasium* is usually called the "humanistic" school, these men claim that modern humanism is not to be modeled after the ancient, but is far superior to it. Since humanity has made such rapid progress in modern times, they see no reason why we should be tethered to Greece and Rome. Genuine humanistic training is therefore declared to be that which is adapted to the humanity of to-day and emphasizes the objects of living interest. Some emphasize mathematics and natural science as the chief studies; others philosophy and history; and others the modern languages; while it is thought that the substance and spirit of the classics can be obtained from translations.

The higher culture of Germany is based too much on the ancient classics to give such views general recognition among scholars. The vast majority might admit it to be general but not liberal. There are disputes as to the kind and amount of classical training required; but German scholarship is not prepared to sever its intimate connection with ancient humanism.

The only school which can seriously claim to rival the *Gymnasium* in furnishing a liberal education is the Real *Gymnasium*. The change of name in 1882 from First Class Real School to Real *Gymnasium*, by the Minister, is recognized as an advance of this school to a rank nearer that of the *Gymnasium*. The following is the official schedule of

## INSTRUCTION IN THE REAL GYMNASIUM.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total.	Compared with 1859. <sup>1</sup>
Religious Instruction . . . . .	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	19	-1
German . . . . .	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	27	-2
Latin . . . . .	8	7	7	6	6	5	5	5	5	54	+10
French . . . . .	-	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	34	
English . . . . .	-	-	-	4	4	3	3	3	3	20	
History and Geography . . . . .	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	30	
Mathematics . . . . .	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	44	-3
Natural History . . . . .	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	15	
Physics . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	6	-4
Chemistry . . . . .	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	6	
Writing . . . . .	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-3
Drawing . . . . .	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	-2
Total per week . . . . .	28	30	30	32	32	32	32	32	32		

There is no Greek in the course, and about half as much Latin

<sup>1</sup> The last column indicates the increase or decrease of hours compared with the plan of the First Class Real School prevailing from 1859 to 1882.

as in the *Gymnasium*. The emphasis is not on the classics, but on mathematics, natural science, and modern languages. The law of 1882 for the *Gymnasium* made a concession to the realistic tendency by taking eleven hours from the classics and adding them to modern languages, mathematics, and natural science; while in the *Real Gymnasium* a concession is made to the old humanistic school by adding ten hours to Latin and taking nine from modern languages, mathematics, and natural science. The Minister gives this explanation of the increase in Latin: "In by far the greater number of cases the results of the instruction in Latin did not correspond with the time devoted to it, and still less with the importance attached to the language in this institution." Educators unanimously testified that this was due to the fact that the number of hours devoted to the study in the higher classes was not sufficient. On the other hand natural science had become relatively too prominent for the purposes of the school.

The two institutions have thus been made more nearly homogeneous. Some educators are in favor of getting rid of these various intermediate schools by establishing one which unites their advantages and prepares equally for all departments of scholarship. It is claimed that while all pupils pursue the same studies in the lower classes, there might be optional studies in the higher ones, thus adapting them to such as desire to pay more attention to the classics, to modern languages, or to science. But the views are so conflicting, the objects aimed at in education so numerous and varied, that the Minister has declared it impossible to establish such a school at present. By making the schools more nearly homogeneous, greater uniformity in culture, so much emphasized here, is attained, and other advantages are also gained. As particular privileges are attached to different schools, it becomes necessary to determine before graduation what career in life is to be chosen. Now the studies of the *Gymnasium* and *Real Gymnasium* are so arranged that at the end of three years the pupil can easily change from one institution to the other, thus deferring the necessity of choosing the school for graduation till the age of twelve or thirteen.

Although the plan adopted in 1882 is Prussian, other German states are adapting their systems to it, and we are justified in regarding it as typical. The government regards both the *Gymnasium* and the *Real Gymnasium* as furnishing a general education, but it puts the former first, and regards the other as still on trial. The position of the government is evident from the privi-



leges granted to the different schools. The Gymnasium is peculiarly favored, every position being accessible to its graduates. In point of military service all the schools are equal; the pupil who completes a course of six years in any one of them is obliged to serve only one year in the army; and a large proportion of the pupils pursue the course chiefly for the sake of this advantage. In 1870 Von Mühler, then Minister of Education, issued an order to the effect that the Gymnasium is to be regarded as the chief means of preparing for the university; but graduates of the First Class, or Latin Real School, might be matriculated into the Philosophical Faculty of the university, and after a course of three years admitted to examination for the position of teachers of mathematics, natural science, and modern languages, but only in Real Schools,<sup>1</sup> and the authorities were reminded that the broader and more thorough linguistic culture of the Gymnasium gave its graduates the preference in the selection of teachers of modern languages, even for Real Schools.

In spite of the most persistent efforts and constant agitation on the part of the friends of the Real Gymnasium, no new privileges have thus far been gained; their opponents have, in fact, tried to deprive them of those already granted. The plan of 1882 ended the hopes of greater concessions at present. A special effort has been made to secure the privilege of entering the medical profession, it being claimed that a knowledge of Greek is not essential to that profession, and that the special attention devoted to natural science fits the graduates peculiarly for the study of medicine. In 1879 one hundred and sixty-three medical societies gave their views on the admission of such students into the Medical Faculty of the university. Only three were unconditionally in favor of it, but ninety-eight emphasized the need of so changing the Gymnasium as better to adapt its curriculum to the needs of the age. The following are among the reasons given by the societies for the exclusion of the graduates of the Real Gymnasium: the same rule should be applied to all Faculties, and the medical one should not be used for experimenting as to the fitness of such graduates, particularly as the experiment would be likely to introduce inferior men into the profession; the admission of such men would lower the rank of the medical in comparison with the other professions; the realism of the medical profession requires, as a counteracting element, the ideal culture for which the Gymnasium lays the basis;

<sup>1</sup> While writing this, the report comes that hereafter graduates of Real Gymnasias may also be appointed as teachers in Gymnasias.



the culture furnished by the Real Gymnasium is special rather than of a general humanistic character; the admission of such students would prove a disturbing element at the university, causing division among the students, and requiring a change in the lectures so as to adapt them to the different degrees of culture; and the Greek language is needed for the terminology. While these objections are pronounced invalid by the friends of the Real Gymnasium, the opponents insist that the admission is, to say the least, extremely doubtful, and that the matter is too momentous to admit of experiments. There are serious complaints now respecting the efficiency of medical students, and there is apprehension lest a change in the standard of admission to the Medical Faculty might lower still more the standard of scholarship. Some medical scholars favor an increase of the study of medicine from four to five years, unless students enter the Faculty better prepared than at present.<sup>1</sup>

The privileges of graduates from the Real Gymnasium were discussed in the Prussian legislature in 1882. The Minister thought it better to leave the subject to the future, to be determined by the results of the plan adopted that year. In the dis-

<sup>1</sup> In Holland the title "Doctor of Medicine" can be obtained only by those who have graduated from a Gymnasium. But for medical practice this title is not necessary, and the majority of practitioners content themselves with that of "physician," which can be obtained without such graduation. Privileges once granted to the Real Schools in Holland have been withdrawn, and those who want to devote themselves to the study of mathematics and natural science in the university must come from the Gymnasium. Those coming from other schools are subjected to a rigid examination in the classics. Pupils enter the Gymnasium about the age of thirteen, the requirements being reading, writing, arithmetic, some knowledge of the history of their own country and geography, and the elements of French. The course of the Gymnasium lasts six years, and is arranged according to the following schedule of 1878:—

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total.
Greek.....	—	6	6	7	7	8	34
Latin.....	8	6	6	6	7	7	40
Dutch.....	3	2	2	2	2	1	12
French.....	4	2	2	2	1	1	12
German.....	—	3	2	2	2	1	10
English.....	—	—	3	3	2	1	9
History.....	4	3	3	2	2	3	17
Geography.....	3	2	2	1	—	1	9
Mathematics.....	4	3	3	3	5	5	23
Physics and Chemistry.....	—	—	—	—	2	2	4
Natural History.....	2	2	—	—	2	2	8
Total per week.....	28	29	29	28	32	32	

cussion he said: "Already, in 1876, Minister Falk inquired of the Philosophical Faculties of the universities how the students prepared in the First Class Real School — Real Gymnasium — had sustained themselves in the examinations, particularly how they had succeeded in modern languages, mathematics, and natural science. In general the answers were favorable respecting students of mathematics and natural science, it being stated, as a rule, that there was no difference in these departments between students from the two institutions. Many even affirmed that graduates from Real Schools had done particularly well. In several reports it was stated that the general preparation and logical training of graduates from the Gymnasia were superior; but it was admitted that the others were able to comprehend the lectures. In one instance it was argued that the preparation of students from the Real Gymnasium was inadequate in natural science, owing partly to insufficient knowledge of Latin, partly to the fact that Greek had not been studied. But in another instance it was argued that this defect was compensated for in practice. The pupils from the Real School in general seemed at first better prepared in mathematics, but often failed to sustain themselves afterwards when greater difficulties were met, and they were regularly overtaken by graduates from the Gymnasia." Some regarded the graduates from the Real Gymnasium as less capable of productive labor; but a professor of mathematics declared that, on an average, he found that they had more independence in mathematics, and, in their opinions, were less controlled by the authority of others. "Less favorable are the reports of professors respecting their proficiency in the Germanic and Romanic languages, and this is really the point about which the discussion always centres. Only two reports state that graduates from Real Schools are not behind the others in this department; but while their zeal was recognized, the view generally prevailed that in the modern languages they are inferior to the graduates from the Gymnasia." A number of Faculties had requested that permission to study modern languages at the university should be withdrawn, unless the students subjected themselves to another examination. The minister in 1882 realized the difficulty of determining the question of privileges, but concluded that no more could be granted at present; it must be determined by further trial. "I think it a mistake to decide the question now." In 1870 Minister von Mühler had pronounced both institutions coördinate, as far as general culture was concerned; but in 1882 Minister von Goslar

was not prepared to admit that the educational results of both are identical.

Dr. Bonitz, member of the Bureau of Education, and a high authority in pedagogics, stated in the legislature that both the Real Gymnasium and the Upper Real School had proved satisfactory. He is an advocate of the study of the classics, but pronounced it a mistake to make a general higher culture depend unconditionally on them. "It is impossible to maintain such a position." Since the modern languages are taught just like the ancient, he did not see why they could not give a similar linguistic culture. He therefore held that, besides the Gymnasium, the continued existence of the Real School, with and without Latin, is justified.<sup>1</sup> Among the members of the legislature, as in the public at large, conflicting views prevailed in 1882 respecting the merits and privileges of the Real Schools.

The discussion of this subject now seems interminable, and the confusion endless; and in a brief article not even a general outline of the variety of views can be given. In education the instruction in the intermediate schools is the burning question of the day. The discussions which fill educational journals show that a crisis has come for the Gymnasium, and that it must solve the problem how much of its traditions it can retain and yet meet the intellectual requirements of the age. The agitation reveals all the partisanship, the dogmatism, and also the hesitation and uncertainty, of transitional periods. The culture of the land is based so exclusively on the Gymnasium that the scholars may be charged with prejudice in favoring the continued monopoly of that institution; but it may be questioned whether the radicals, controlled by the modern realistic spirit, are more impartial. Nor is the religious aspect wholly excluded from the consideration. It was through the Reformation that the Greek was fostered in the schools, mainly for the sake of the Greek Testament; and it is not strange that the ultramontanes regard it with less favor than their ecclesiastical language, the Latin.

The Real Gymnasium has not had full opportunity for showing what it can do, because the privileges of its graduates have been so limited. In the few departments where they have been per-

<sup>1</sup> Among other positions, the Upper Real School prepares its pupils to become architects. But this was decidedly opposed by architects, who claimed that a knowledge of Latin should be required.

In 1882 there were 12 Upper Real Schools in Prussia, 99 Real Gymnasias, and 254 Gymnasias.

mitted to enter into competition with graduates from the Gymnasias the results are still doubtful. They are apparently gaining ground, and there are indications that they are overcoming some of the prejudices against them. Their rivalry has had a healthy influence on the Gymnasias, which are intent on improvement, so as to retain their preëminence. From all sides the sharpest criticism has come, and the rival schools are subjected to the severest tests. The Gymnasium holds the field, and is determined to continue to do so; whether its supremacy can be successfully disputed remains to be seen.

We cannot settle the dispute by an appeal to pedagogical authorities. Not only are these themselves contradictory, but it is impossible to determine the impartiality and competence of these authorities. The views of professors in the universities would be more weighty if wholly unprejudiced, if they came in more direct contact with their students, and if they had had longer experience with graduates of Real Gymnasias. The views of some educators have gained special prominence and caused much discussion, and they are here given as specimens of the various conflicting opinions.

It was naturally expected that the Real Gymnasium would meet with most favor from physicians and scientists; but among them it has found some of its sharpest opponents. On becoming Rector of the University of Berlin, Professor A. W. Hofmann, the eminent chemist, affirmed that all efforts to find a substitute for the study of the ancient classics, whether in the modern languages or mathematics or natural science, had thus far proved a failure. As a result of his observation he says: "Never have I heard any one who came from a Gymnasium express the wish that he had been educated at a Real School; but how often have I met young men prepared in Real Schools who deeply regretted that they had not enjoyed the training of a Gymnasium!" The statistics, he thinks, are decidedly favorable to the latter. "The ideality of academical study, the unselfish devotion to science as science, the free exercise of thought — both the condition and the result of this devotion — recede in proportion as the classic basis, such as the Gymnasium furnishes as propædeutics for the university, is withdrawn. It is true that this is first of all a personal conviction drawn from personal observation; but I have had much occasion to speak of the matter with friends devoted to physics and mathematics, and with scarcely an exception I found that they had the same conviction." In the same year Dr. H. Ruehle, Professor of Medicine,

delivered an address as Rector of the University of Bonn, in which he also gave the decided preference to the *Gymnasium*.

In the opinion of the professors of the University of Berlin on the privileges of graduates from the Real *Gymnasium*, Dr. Zupitza, Professor of Modern Languages, stated that he had not found them properly prepared in Latin for his department, the English language. For this opinion he was severely attacked by the friends of the Real *Gymnasium*. In defending himself he emphasized this opinion, and gave the grounds on which it was based. He declared that students from the Real *Gymnasium* had found it hard to understand the grammatical instruction because they had not studied Greek; they also showed a lack of sharpness in apprehension and of independence in judgment. As a member of the examining committee of the university he had found that, as a rule, they did not stand as good an examination as graduates from the *Gymnasia*.

On the other hand we find that Professor Lunge, chemist in the University of Zurich, speaks highly of graduates from the Real *Gymnasium*. Voices have also been heard from Würzburg confirming his favorable opinion. Professor Trautmann, of Bonn, found them well prepared for modern languages. Dr. Stengal, Professor of Modern Languages at Marburg, was at first prejudiced against their admission into the university, but now warmly advocates it: "Only long and quiet observation of my hearers led me to abandon one prejudice after another against the Real School." At first he took it for granted that the bright students came from the *Gymnasia*, the dull ones from the Real Schools; but he repeatedly found himself mistaken. He generally found the latter more eager to learn than the others. To these favorable opinions must be added the fact that in a number of competitions at the universities students from the Real *Gymnasium* have carried off the prizes.

The friends of the Real *Gymnasium*, not content with the privileges of the Philosophical Faculty, have not abandoned the hope that its graduates will also be admitted to the Medical Faculty, and eventually to that of Law. But an increase of privileges will be required soon if the institution is to sustain itself. With a course as long as that of the *Gymnasium*, the graduate now finds himself excluded from most of the learned careers; and it is not surprising that the *Gymnasium* ranks highest and is still the favorite school. In Alsace and Lorraine the Real *Gymnasium* has been abolished, and in Prussia a number have been converted

into Gymnasia, a process which will no doubt continue unless new privileges are granted.

While the Real Gymnasium may maintain itself, there seems to be no serious apprehension on the part of scholars generally that it will supersede the Gymnasium as the means of liberal culture in the highest and best sense. There are not a few scholars who emphasize Greek still more than Latin, both for the sake of the language and its literary treasures, declaring that the road to liberal culture lies through Hellas.<sup>1</sup> Although the Real Gymnasium finds much favor among the people because more realistic and more practical, scholars fear that it will tend to special rather than to general training, so as to prepare for particular technical and industrial pursuits rather than for liberal culture, and that its realism will tend to supersede, or at least subordinate, the humanistic and ideal elements.

But with all the favor bestowed on the Gymnasium by scholars and the authorities it is far from giving satisfaction; and it is evident that the reformed rather than the present Gymnasium will be the institution for the liberal education of the future. The best friends of the institution are most urgent in their demand for changes. An ideal school meeting all cases and all demands is of course out of the question; but charges of disappointment at the results come from all the Faculties of the university, from the professions, and from the various callings in life, and are too deep and wide-spread to be ignored. Many will agree with the rector of a prominent Gymnasium who said to the writer: "We have committed great errors; but we are seeing this and are working hard to overcome them."

While it is generally admitted that changes are needed in the Gymnasium, there is a wide divergence of opinion as to what they should be. Some want to add new studies, such as philosophy, chemistry, or English, while others want to change the relative prominence of the studies, taking hours from the classics and transferring them to history, science, or modern languages. It is said that now the graduates are prepared neither in the classics nor in science for the university. In view of their prominence, it is certainly surprising that the instruction in the classics does not produce more satisfactory results. It may be that the pupils lack inspiration in their study, owing partly to the utilistic ten-

<sup>1</sup> Professor Steinthal, of Berlin, says: "Deutscher Geist ist ohne Hellenismus undenkbar. . . . Wir Alle sind allzumal Barbaren, und zur Humanität führt nur ein Weg, der Weg über Hellas."



dency of the day, partly to the fact that other important studies crowd them into the background. It would be necessary to ignore the progress of science during this century to claim for them their former relative prominence. "It is evident that the philology of to-day exerts but little influence on the general condition of German culture." When friends of the classics make such admissions, what wonder if the pupils are not enthusiastic in their study? But the lack of inspiration is largely due to the manner in which they have been taught. It is a common complaint that too much time is spent on grammatical forms and syntax, while the spirit and substance of classical literature are neglected. The means is thus made the end, it is said; whereas the language should be learned to introduce the pupil into the history of the ancients, their forms of government, their religious views, their ideals, and into all the rich treasures of antiquity. The pupils frequently get the impression that the course is adapted chiefly, if not solely, to philologists and theologians. In the beginning, when least prepared for them, the boys are obliged to devote most attention to severe analysis and dry abstractions; hence many cherish an aversion to the classics, and thus lose much of their value for mental discipline and humanistic culture. Professor Du-Bois Reymond, for twenty-five years examiner of pupils coming from Gymnasias, says: "In the Gymnasias the pupils are satiated and disgusted with classical studies, and are repelled by torture in thoughtless forms."<sup>1</sup>

Aside from their contents, it is declared that the classical languages themselves are not well learned, and that consequently the time spent on them is largely wasted. The grammar, it is held, should be learned from the language, not the language from the grammar; hence more reading of authors is required and less of the wearisome drill in grammatical forms. Since 1837 there has been increased attention to grammatical drill; but we are told that "in spite of the increase of formal instruction in grammar there is still, even up to the highest classes, much uncertainty in grammar; and the exegetical knowledge of the pupil has not increased; still less has the amount of reading, the ease of comprehension, and the readiness of production been augmented." If

<sup>1</sup> Minister von Goslar, as we have seen, in 1882 abolished the Greek composition at the final examination, and substituted for it translations from Greek authors, in order to encourage more attention to the spirit and contents of the language. In Baden a proposition to do the same was discussed, but only three out of sixteen directors of Gymnasias favored the change.



this demand of more substance and less form is a concession to realism, it is a concession which also promotes idealism and humanism in classical studies. At a meeting of the school directors of the Rhenish Province, in 1884, it was decided, with reference to Greek, that "instruction in grammar is to be made wholly subservient to reading; and everything not directly necessary for this is to be rejected from the teaching of form and syntax, but whatever is essential is to be more thoroughly taught."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, unless the classical instruction in the Gymnasia proves more satisfactory, these schools are in danger of losing their prestige. In an address Du-Bois Reymond said, in 1877, that he regarded the reform of the Gymnasium as the best means of stemming the flood of realism which threatens to overwhelm modern culture. Recently, in republishing the address, he states in a note that he favors the retention of Greek in the Gymnasium, but is surprised to find that some two years after graduation many medical students cannot define such words as "Dyslyse" and "Kreosot," nor is it uncommon for them to confound the second with the fourth Latin declension. Neither does that institution prepare properly in mathematics. The school, consequently, does not furnish the requisite preparation for medical study, and the Real Gymnasium really gives a better one. He wants the Gymnasium so reformed as to meet the demands of the day.

From parents, physicians, and teachers the complaint is frequently heard that the scholars have too much to do. The numerous lessons and the multitude of subjects are said to make demands on them which prevent thoroughness and injure the health. Not merely the thirty lessons a week are to be considered, but also the exactions made in the lessons.<sup>2</sup> Some thirty years ago even Alexander von Humboldt declared, that "if he had been subjected to the educational system then prevalent, he would have been ruined physically and mentally."

There would be less complaint of "overburdening" (*Ueberbürdung*) if the curriculum admitted freedom of choice in the

<sup>1</sup> In the last two years about 400 hours are devoted to Greek, and it was held that these should be divided equally between prose and poetry, the prose to consist of Plato, Thucydides, and Demosthenes, and in poetry the first place was assigned to the Iliad, of which the greater part is to be read, and of Sophocles at least one tragedy.

<sup>2</sup> Formerly the number of recitations was greater, but less must have been required of the pupil. The Philanthropin of Basedow had 50 hours a week. The Lyceum in Carlsruhe had 40 lessons a week in 1813; in 1827 it had 38, besides English, singing, and gymnastics.

studies or in some of them; but this is excluded. The severe unity of the government and the predominance of the rigid military spirit are powerfully felt in the schools, particularly in Prussia. Not only does the state demand that every child shall attend school from the age of six till fourteen, but it also determines the exact character of the instruction required to prepare men to become officials and to enter the learned professions. The official class is very large and influential, and graduation from certain schools is the condition for employment in the various departments of government, such as bureaus of education, diplomacy, agriculture, forestry, industry, railroads, telegraphs, and the post-office. For architects, teachers, lawyers, doctors, and preachers, a definite course is also prescribed. Cities or communities may establish schools of higher grade, but the state determines the exact nature of the instruction and examination, if the numerous privileges depending on the government are to be enjoyed.

In the *Gymnasium* and *Real Gymnasium* every study is unalterably fixed for the student. Peculiar adaptation or preference may lead to special efficiency in certain subjects, but none can be omitted or others substituted for them. The advantages and disadvantages of this uniformity and rigidity are apparent. A boy is not obliged to enter a particular sphere, but if he selects or his parents choose for him an official or learned career, the conditions are absolutely determined. From the very beginning the youth is thus subjected to authority, and obedience is enforced. No pains are spared to accomplish whatever can be done by teaching and drilling. Natures specially strong in intellect and will may retain their vigor and even develop independence and originality, if not by means of this system, in spite of it. But it seems to be forgotten that uniformity is not unity; that the pupils are not all equally adapted to the same studies, and that all cannot do an equal amount of work; that the mind does not exist for the studies, but the studies for the mind; and that the intellect is not a machine to be run according to mechanical laws. There is, evidently, not enough room for spontaneity, for exercising peculiar gifts, for cultivating originality, and for the development of will and the formation of character by exercising the power of choice. Whoever considers these facts, and understands the importance of the will in training, will not be surprised to read in Oettingen's "*Moral-statistik*": "In all our schools it is only the understanding that is developed; the school concerns itself little about ethical culture."

Besides this rigidity in the entire course we must also take into account the severity of the final examination. The requirements are such that it is usually anticipated with nervous dread, and toward the close the studies are often pursued with reference to it rather than to real scholarship. In languages and in history the faculty chiefly exercised is the memory, and the temptation to cramming is almost irresistible. That this militates seriously against thoroughness in scholarship is evident, and we can understand the general complaint that the Gymnasias do not accomplish the expected work.<sup>1</sup>

A recent graduate from a Bavarian Gymnasium gives an account of experiences which hardly seem possible in our day.<sup>2</sup> Yet the school is said to be highly regarded in the kingdom. The character of the instruction had a deadening effect on the intellect, and the mass of material to be learned was so great that only the memory could be exercised. Both teachers and scholars were subjected to a mechanical routine, so that spontaneity and real culture were out of the question. The religious instruction by the Catholic priest partook of the general military severity of the school. The pupil stood to the teacher in a relation of slavish subjection, and the entire process of education was a species of torture, whose cruelty increased in proportion to the approach of the final examination. The author closes as follows:—

“Many a promising youth was spoiled by means of this spiritless discipline, and was thus lost to the nation in which he might have accomplished something. If you still find in our ranks men who appreciate religion and national poetry, and who regard culture, morality, and all manly virtue as pillars of the state and worthy of being prized above all else; and (to be perfectly frank) if we still care for anything that is respectful, rational, and useful, then it is not on account but *in spite of* our training in the Gymnasium.”

Such a school would hardly be possible in Prussia, but a Prussian educator speaks of the half-culture promoted by Gymnasias, which might lead to a species of Russian Nihilism; of filling the memory with facts and sharpening the understanding, while the will and ethical culture are neglected; of deadening the emotion

<sup>1</sup> These various evils are discussed in numerous articles in pedagogical journals, also in books and pamphlets. A brief but fair discussion of them is found in *Pädagogische Ideale und Proteste*, by Dr. L. Wiese, an experienced educator and warm friend of the Gymnasium.

<sup>2</sup> Gustav von Leuchtenring, in *Zeitschrift für das höhere Unterrichtswesen Deutschlands*, January 1 and 8, 1886.

and judgment respecting right, and robbing the mind of natural freshness and vigor.<sup>1</sup>

Add to this rigorous discipline a will that asserts itself in spite of all obstacles and even develops itself through their influence, and an intellect so vigorous that even such demands on it only serve to strengthen it, and we can appreciate the fact that German scholars have flourished with such a training as their basis. We cannot question that some may need just such discipline. But we are probably inclined to attribute to the Gymnasium of to-day what does not exclusively belong to it. Some are seriously inquiring whether German intellect is sustaining itself. Is there not a decadence in philosophy, theology, poetry, and general literature, to say nothing of other departments? Are German preachers, lawyers, and statesmen really superior to those of other nations? Do we find in the officials and the vast multitudes who have enjoyed a course in the Gymnasium that breadth and freedom and comprehensiveness of view, and that justice to all that pertains to humanity (not merely to Prussia or Germany), which must characterize every genuine liberal education? I do not answer these questions, but propose them for reflection. Sometimes we wonder why schools in philosophy and theology are so easily formed in Germany. Perhaps a sharp distinction between the accumulation of learned material and the development of vigorous, independent thought will help to solve the problem. Not wholly, but largely, the scholarship of Germany is in its eminent professors, and we are apt to attribute to the Gymnasium what is the product of the opportunities, inspiration and almost unparalleled intellectual devotion and efforts of those who have chosen what is here called "the learned career," namely, the position of a professor. We may not overestimate German scholarship, but we look for its sole source where this is not found; we may ascribe it to the many when it is rather a monopoly of the few; and we are apt to put into the present what really belongs to the past.

The kind of training which Wiese calls "the severe logic of the Prussian system" is evidently not a perfect preparation for the university or for life. When, about the age of twenty, the pupil comes from "this absolute force" to the absolute freedom of the university, we cannot be surprised that the passage from one extreme to the other is often attended with disastrous consequences. Never before permitted to choose any studies, the students are now obliged to choose all they pursue. Many come to

<sup>1</sup> Wiese, 15.

the university totally unfit for the liberty thrust upon them. Time is wasted, mistakes are made in the choice of lectures; the very absence of the former excessive restraint creates a feeling called freedom, but in reality it is lawlessness; it is spoken of as a good time in which life must be enjoyed; beer drinking is frequently indulged in to great excess, and even Germans admit that thus the beginning of a course of intemperance is at times begun; the first semester is frequently lost, perhaps the second likewise; and habits are not seldom formed which result in moral, mental, and physical ruin. That these results are not uncommon is confirmed by the testimony of students, professors, and parents, and is also the result of my own observation in different universities. One who knows the facts in the case is not surprised that the Law Faculty of the University of Berlin petitioned the Minister to make the course of study in that Faculty four years, not only because the students come without the proper scientific spirit, but also because they understood by freedom in learning the freedom to learn nothing.

In order to remove the evils of excessive freedom after excessive restraint, it has been proposed to institute examinations in at least one prominent study at the close of each semester, and also to require proof that the student has actually attended lectures. Judges and lawyers have proposed that there should be an examination in the middle of the course for such students as desire to enter the legal profession, declaring that something is imperatively demanded in order to elevate the standard of scholarship.<sup>1</sup>

All the Faculties of German universities swarm with "bread and butter students" (*Brodstudium*), whose inspiration is a diploma as the condition of an appointment that will secure a living. It is self-evident that the examination, not the scientific spirit or love of learning, is their impulse to study, or *ochsen* as they significantly call it. We cannot dignify the learning acquired by such with the name of liberal culture. The aim controlling so

<sup>1</sup> *Studienfreiheit und Studienzwang auf der Universität*, by Alphons Thun, in *Die Gegenwart*, July 4, 1885. Prof. L. von Bar, of Göttingen, in *Die Nation*, February 27th, states that drinking, dueling, and the affairs connected therewith, are in the case of many students of law the only concerns until the last semester or two. "The number of really diligent law students is the minority. . . . Let us add, that there is a very large number of students who from principle (*grundsätzlich*) never hear a course of lectures on law, who do not even know, when they see him, the professor for whose lectures they have subscribed." They depend wholly on an "*Einpauker*" to cram them for the examination.

many students need but be known in order to appreciate the complaints of the authorities that the spirit of the true student is so often lacking, that philosophy is so generally neglected, and that the highest culture is not the impelling motive.

It is, of course, impossible to determine exactly how far the Gymnasium is to blame for the failure to develop the spirit of liberal culture in so large a proportion of its pupils; but it is evident that the question *how* the studies shall be pursued is at least as important as *what* shall be studied. Educators insist on a change in the training of teachers. The duties imposed on them are burdensome, and there is too little opportunity for freedom and spontaneity. But it is also evident that they suffer from mistakes made at the Gymnasium and university. There is serious complaint that the philosophic spirit, so essential to successful instruction, is generally lacking, and that the work of the instructor very often degenerates to the perfunctory labor of spiritless routine.<sup>1</sup>

Already the allotted space is transgressed upon, and there is no room for even a summary of what reforms are needed. With at least twelve years of the greatest intellectual advantages the world affords, at the best period of life, great results may be expected. So long as the accumulation of a mass of material to be used at examination is the condition for an exalted and profitable career, it must be expected that for a large proportion of the students this accumulation will be made the chief concern. Some exceptionally strong natures may overcome the evils and reap all the benefits of the machinery of education, particularly when placed in the chair of a professor. But if freedom, independence, a vigorous originality, a scientific spirit, and a great ethical personality based on deep and broad culture, are the aim, then the Gymnasium, taking into account the vast majority of its students, is lamentably deficient.

With examinations which emphasize the real ability of the student more and his absorptive power less; with fewer studies but more thoroughness; with less teaching and more training; with more room for originality, for independent research, for developing special aptitudes, and for exercising the will by throwing the pupil more on his moral resources and responsibility; and by making a philosophical training of the mental powers, particu-

<sup>1</sup> Professor Steinthal says: "Es ist ja zum Erschrecken, wie wenig Verständniß für Philosophie und allgemeine Grammatik unsere heutigen Gymnasial-Lehrer haben."



larly the power to think, more prominent than the overloading of the memory, the Gymnasium would overcome those serious defects which its friends lament, and would meet the intellectual requirements of the day as it cannot do now. But the evils are recognized, and thus the first condition for improvement is found. With these improvements we may expect Germany's leadership in some departments of thought not only to be strengthened, but may also expect richer intellectual and moral results for more of its sons, and less general complaint that so many of them are thrown on the world helpless. The age needs liberal culture organized into character; and the school which aims at this culture will meet the requirements of the times, particularly in free countries, better than one which turns men into encyclopædias. With a school that trains all the powers for vigorous, healthy exercise there will be less complaint than at present of learning without ability.

*J. H. W. Stuckenberg.*

BERLIN, GERMANY.

---

### THE LIFE OF WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.<sup>1</sup>

It were absurd to ascribe to the single agency of any individual man or epoch the overthrow of slavery in the United States. As well attribute the Falls of Niagara to the agitation of the Rapids. That overthrow was borne on by forces from the far past, — those of social progress, Christian faith, and Christian civilization, — by the spirit of the age, and the trend of the world.

Antagonism to slavery had never been dormant or silent in our history. Perpetual protests in the colonial period, at the declaration of independence, in political convulsion amounting well-nigh to divulsion at the birth of the Constitution and the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, also in anti-slavery utterances by publicists and statesmen, churches and associations, as well as in the popular press North and South, — all gave evidence of the deep and abiding consciousness of the "irrepressible conflict" in our national life. Into a moral atmosphere charged with this consciousness Garrison's life was cast. Indeed, such an atmosphere he first breathed. It was this that shaped and colored his mind from early childhood. In a community imbued with this

<sup>1</sup> WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, 1805-1879. *The Story of his Life told by his Children.* Volumes I. and II., 1805-1840. New York: The Century Co. 1885.



alone could his agitation have found material or scope in which to work, especially to work so mightily. So with all the great world reforms. They are generally outgrowths and exponents of the world's life.

Yet great social movements work through individual men, and often so conspicuously and potently that they seem to be creators of that which created them, and of which they are but exponents, excitants, or instruments. They so affect the rapidity, intensity, complexion, and course of such movements that they are lastingly in the world's thought identified with them as authors and representatives; are installed by it in its Hall of Heroes; and — the glamour of victory investing alike their virtues and their defects — they are crowned as ideals of heroic and successful reform, to be honored and emulated in after times.

That there is such a disposition extending through this country, and especially abroad, so to regard the man whose life is portrayed in these volumes, claiming for him the place of honor not only in the roll of the heroic and martyr age just past, but of our entire American history, is evident from the frequency with which his career is referred to in public addresses and current literature amid commonplace examples of the grand and victor type of successful reform; of which addresses we have recently listened to one from the lips of the eminent divine, lecturer, and writer, whose beauty of thought and of soul has so much charmed our people in his late visit to us from our mother island.

The tendency to this view of Mr. Garrison's character, whether true or mistaken, will give to his "Life," as presented in these handsome volumes, especial interest, and it is this aspect of it, as presenting the ideal of the "successful reformer," more than any general summary, analysis, or review, that will engage us in this article.

The question of the quality of its ideals is one of the gravest that can affect a people. The more scrupulously we analyze and clarify our ideals the better; and this not to the falsification of history, but to the separating of the spurious from the genuine, the worthless from the precious in the objects of our admiration. Nothing is more mischievous than indiscriminate hero-worship rendered to a conglomerate of miscellaneous qualities — the noble and the ignoble alike — presented in the same life. To vitiate our ideals is to poison our life at its very fountain.

There is, moreover, an impression, especially abroad, of Garrison's agency in the anti-slavery reform that wrongs and degrades

the American people, — that of a solitary denouncer of an enormous national sin, in the presence of a people with little conscience or honor, and incited to wanton and mean persecution and outrage by alarmed selfish greed and social and political cowardice. It would seem as if the old heroic strain had perished and all the granite had gone out of Plymouth Rock.

But the history of the anti-slavery struggle itself contradicts this. To speak of nothing else, a nation that creates not only a Garrison, but the group of heroic spirits that gathered around him in this great battle, and that gave a response so prompt and potent to his appeals, could not be without moral sensibility and nobility. And surely its mighty spontaneous uprising, when Secession under the flag of slavery stormed Sumter, and its wrestle through the agony of the civil war with Disunion and the dark power that brooded it, till they both were crushed beneath its feet, were not the acts of a people with whom the old heroic was dead.

It will add to the interest of these volumes that the "Life" here presented is in truth autobiographic, not, indeed, formally, ostensibly, or consciously so, but a transcript, or rather a daguerreotype of the living man in his own writings, in public addresses, reports, or newspaper paragraphs, and more, in the careless freedom and spontaneous utterance of private correspondence with friends; in which, with no conscious posing for the public eye, he shows to us his living self, his thought, feeling, purpose, and opinion in the actual presence of affairs and personages. It is his self-revelation, a life photograph, evidently reliable as true to the original; and all the more as it is not entirely colorless, but inevitably tinged with the bias to self-advocacy and self-approval that attaches to the egotism of our common nature.

The biography thus presented is, moreover, full of living and dramatic fascination, as it exhibits quite a picture gallery of many notable men and women of the times amid which its subject moved.

It has also additional claim on our estimation and our trust as it is ably edited by two of Mr. Garrison's sons, who are so loyal to their father, and so confident in the rectitude of his utterance and his action, that they believe the truest picture will be the most honorable to him; insomuch that little suspicion haunts the reader of any conscious unfairness in their selection from his papers or any garbling with a view to concealment or false impression. Their course in this regard seems open and honorable and fearless

of sinister or adverse constructions which many may be likely to put upon passages in these letters.

But while we say this, we are glad we cannot acquit them of the bias of loyal filial love and honor. We have never been admirers of the elder Brutus, sitting in judgment of death upon his own sons. That is not heroism. It is simply revolting and monstrous.

We are compelled, then, in view of the material and the editorship of this compilation to read with the consciousness of the fact, that this compilation, with all its fairness of purpose and selection, still cannot be otherwise than a self-advocating plea and an *ex parte* statement.

It is also an unfortunate incident to this mode of compiling a Life, that the letters in these volumes are full of accusations, imputations, and suspicions thrown out against those differing from the writer, such as those persons would have repelled and resented, and such as their children and representatives will repel and resent, as false and calumnious, and which ought in fairness to be counter-checked by opinions and judgments taken from counter-standpoints. As it is, many of loved and time-honored names, who have vindicated their loyalty to truth and righteousness by faithfulness in great trials and unto death, and whom present and coming generations will continue to regard as being as true to Christian honor and manhood, and as far removed from moral recreancy, duplicity, or cowardice as Garrison himself, will stand newly arraigned in these pages as by accusing voices from the grave, with none now to deny or defend, unless the children shall choose to fight anew the quarrels of their fathers, and old feuds are rekindled over their graves where, it had been felt, it were better they had been buried with their champions and, life's "fitful fever" over, its clamor of conflict silent, the dead might at last sleep together in peace. Their strifes well-nigh forgotten or waiting the calm verdicts of history, whose time is not yet, and perhaps may not be till the Great Judgment itself, it were as well were they dismissed from reminiscence for the while, save as a study for the instruction of future times. And for that they are hardly needed. The weaknesses, meannesses, and cowardices that encounter or accompany in the outset all reforms which approach societies long wonted and long blunted to the evils to be remedied; the follies, faults, wild hopes, the intemperance and impatience of passion and judgment that are wont to attach to their early champions; the sluggishness, timidity, obstinacy, and resent-

ment of conservative parties and especially of all placemen of the old order, — all these may be regarded as matters of course at such times, the accepted normal pathology of reforms, and require no minute chronicling or reiteration.

The story of Garrison's childhood and youth; his early struggle with poverty, hardship, and toil; his industry, integrity, honor, and courage; his love and reverence for his mother, to him another Monica; his patient progress in his trade, — all these, now seen as preparatory and disciplinary to his subsequent career, would attract and detain us. But our main purpose and the limits of this article will not allow us to linger, nor will our space admit of illustration or verification of points or statements we may make in our discussion, by quotation from the numerous passages we have marked for that purpose, but we shall leave the reader for the most part with a reference to the volumes themselves.

The public life of Garrison, as presented in these two volumes, embraces two periods distinctly and differentially marked. The one covers the portion of his public career concentratively devoted to the battle against slavery, with no abiding schism within the anti-slavery body, the differences within it being condoned, or repressed in subordination to the grand issue, — that of immediate emancipation, without deportation, — waged largely under his own leadership. This extended from 1828 to 1837.

The second period, from 1837 to 1840, is that of diversion and distraction from the original supreme end by diverse side-issues, alien or remotely related reforms, which complicated or embarrassed the main enterprise, insomuch that it was at last felt by a large portion of the anti-slavery people to be requisite to disencumber it of them; and to this end they felt it necessary to cut loose from the leadership of Garrison, who extensively had given his adhesion and advocacy to such reforms, and who, from his position as originator or chief of the anti-slavery movement, had thus blent it in public estimation, especially in the slave States, with theories and schemes regarded as wild, visionary, disorganizing, and impracticable fanaticisms warring on civil and ecclesiastical order and on the generally received ideas of theological belief and religious life. They believed it necessary, accordingly, to form separate organizations, with singleness of aim and with distinct political methods and objects, devoted to the supreme cause. With such separation and the rise of new organizations these volumes close, bringing us to a period of separate action, in

which the segments, totally or partially withdrawing from the original Anti-slavery Society, pass through various political combinations and blend ultimately in political action with the Free Soilers, and subsequently the Republican party, by which slavery in the United States is finally overthrown.

The first of these periods is eminently the heroic epoch of Garrison's anti-slavery career. In it he dealt the deadliest blows against slavery. He solemnly and supremely devoted himself to its overthrow. A war upon it possessed him as a mission. A perpetual vision of the unspeakable wrongs and cruelties of American slavery followed and haunted him like a glimpse into the Inferno. His whole nature was on fire with indignation and horror. He could not rest because of it, he could keep no terms with it. He exhausted the dialect of reproach and anathema to wreak his denunciation upon it. Instead of gradual emancipation with expatriation, which was the cheat of the times and their refuge against despair, he demanded immediate abrogation of slavery as a deadly sin against God and man, momentarily challenging the wrath of heaven. He boldly unmasks its hideous features, and cries out upon its dehumanizing atrocities, cruelties, and shames, as with the cry of an Elijah or a John the Baptist, in the ears of the startled nation. He pours out his hot wrath on the slaveholder, often with too little discrimination of motives or conditions and purpose with which the relation is held. He blazons and placards its factors to public abhorrence and infamy, especially those from the North engaged in the interstate traffic in slaves; for which publication he is prosecuted and immured in a Baltimore prison. He is so vehemently impatient to strike right at the heart of the monster evil that he stops little for qualification or apology or mitigating plea of compulsion or righteous purpose that might in exceptional cases break the force of his blow. He lectures, prints, publishes, organizes anti-slavery societies through the Northern states, under the flag of immediate emancipation without deportation. He is indefatigable. Not toil nor penury nor intimidation, not calumny nor outrage can stop his work. The South feels at last that a man terribly in earnest is striking with deadly force and immitigable purpose at her domestic system. Aroused, alarmed, indignant, she appeals to the Northern States to stop his utterances. She denounces, outlaws him, sets a price upon his person. But imprisoned, persecuted, proscribed, caricatured, hunted, mobbed, outlawed, he, nothing daunted, goes right on with his work, scatters papers and pamphlets broadcast over the land, and

sends out agents and apostles of emancipation through the free States, along whose track anti-slavery societies spring up to the number of eight hundred as early as 1837, and then are increasing at the rate of one a day. He crosses the ocean and enlists English philanthropy and eloquence in the cause. His followers meantime had grown so numerous as to attract the attention of the Northern politician and Southern alarmist and legislator. Certainly during this period his history presents us with a career in many respects one of a heroic and successful reformer, the Samson Agonistes of the struggle against American Slavery.

But when he is held up before the public as the ideal of the successful reformer we are compelled to note grave exceptions, which are amply sustained by the volumes before us, — exceptions disastrous in the extreme, and dangerously misleading if accepted as models for emulation. We are constrained to regret the intemperance of thought and language often painfully manifest, and the want of sobriety and justice of discrimination, in the vehemence of his invective and malediction.

In reading Mr. Garrison's writings in these volumes, as elsewhere, the reader will often be compelled to adopt the utterance of Miss Martineau, who, notwithstanding her great admiration of him, writes: "I do not pretend to like or approve of the tone of Mr. Garrison's censures. I could not use such language myself toward any class of offenders; nor could I sympathize with its use by others." We can but regret the use of such language as not in the spirit of the Divine Reformer sent as our true ideal from God, and as tending to taint the movement he was initiating with the virus of fanaticism in its very outset, and as unjust in its indiscriminate wholesale denunciation of all implicated in the legal relation of slavery, however innocently or involuntarily and with whatever consciousness of righteous and benevolent, however mistaken, intent. It was to be regretted still more, as in the sense of injustice and in the resentment it produced it reacted against the cause it was intended to aid, and tended to shut up the slave States against all anti-slavery utterances within their borders.

The like objection lies against his treatment of the advocates of the Colonization Society, who, though their argument is now recognized as illusory and their scheme for the removal of slavery as utterly impracticable, were by no means all hypocrites or knaves, but had among their numbers many of the best and most benevolent and most honored names of their time; whose offense



at the utmost was only that of an honest, though mistaken philanthropy.

No more can we commend his temper and treatment in case of multitudes who, though sympathizing with his main purpose, were repelled by his language and his methods, and felt compelled to stand aloof from him in his movement.

Much must be condoned to the provocations and indignities he suffered, to his impatience with the stupidity, cowardice, and injustice of the public and its leaders, and to a zeal half frenzied with looking into the open hell of American slavery. Yet, in condoning, we imply defects. And a serious defect, surely, in the *model* reformer is the want of patient forbearance with human ignorance and weakness which he must inevitably encounter, and of forgiving self-control under injustice and misrepresentation certain to assail him, and especially of that abiding reliance on strict truth and justice as the mightiest of things, which is the first requisite in him that would grapple with a vast organic social wrong.

From abundant evidence furnished in these volumes alone we are compelled to note as a grave defect in the reformer, and one obstructive of his object, this want of sober and discriminative candor, not to say of Christly charity, in his denunciative utterances.

Nor is it enough to answer that reforms are not wont to be exploited as a specimen of the fine arts, or a passage of courtesies, nor to walk daintily with all the proprieties. We know there must be stern and stalwart fighting, — that sturdy and downright blows must be given and received. Yet the hardest fighting is done with strictest justice, candor, and truth. These are the mightiest weapons, the surest of methods. Indignant denunciation in its hot wrath and haste may be impatient of the limitations and qualifications these may require, and in eagerness to strike downright, direct, and deadly blows at the object of its hate may toss aside discriminative definitions and exceptions and special pleas in justification or mitigation, fearing they may break the force of its stroke. But right direction is as essential as force. Indeed, it is force. The exactest aim, that which discriminates most truly and justly, is the deadliest. Sober, considerate, candid reason is immeasurably stronger than the reckless anathema, that with its wild blows strikes down alike the innocent with the guilty, and results in a sense of injustice and a feeling of resentment and distrust in those thus wronged, while it shields the openly and

shamelessly criminal from public scorn and condemnation by implicating with them in its sweeping malediction those who are felt to be manifestly guiltless of conscious offense, and impresses the public at large as the weakness of hysteric passion rather than the strength of rational logic.

There are those who defend the use of such language as Mr. Garrison employs and, as Miss Martineau suggests, "warily," that is, of set purpose, as legitimate means of startling the popular mind, shocking it into consciousness, and lashing it into agitation in which alone reforms can have their birth and their element. But such persons construe impediments into motive force. Friction is with them the cause and measure of propulsive power. Agitation, opposition, irritated prejudice, shocked decorum, alarm, tumult, popular violence and outrage, whatever stirs the deeps of popular interest or passion, are welcomed, — indeed, invited and provoked as hopeful signs of reform. But these are of themselves simply obstructive. They may be the signs of the natural struggle of old order against change, but do not determine whether the change resisted be good or evil. The reluctance of existing order to die is not necessarily stupidity, selfishness, nor malignity; it is in society the instinct of self-preservation. Needlessly to alarm and irritate it, especially to court hatred, obloquy, outrage, riot, and conflagration, is certainly no sign of righteousness in a reform movement and no augury of success, but is sheer foolhardiness and fanaticism. Righteousness, indeed, may be hated and feared, may gender agitation and strife. But it does not follow that whatever excites hatred, fear, variance, and tumult is therefore righteous. Those who "live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." But those who suffer persecution are by no means always godly. If agitation and notoriety may be adjuncts and adjuvants of a righteous reform, they may also be signs upon a time when all such reforms perish. Notoriety may be infamy, agitation may be only instinctive social revulsion. It will be remembered as especially predicated of the Divine Reformer at his advent, "He shall not cry, or lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets."

The exasperation of prejudice lying not in the immediate path of a reform, or a gratuitous offense to conventional decorum or courtesy, is sheer wanton obstruction. It may be courage, but the courage of the barbarian or ruffian, the clown or the idiot. It may be brave to flaunt the red flag in the face of a horde of enraged bulls, but it is not to be commended for its discretion.

Again, there is, as it seems to us, painfully manifest in the perusal of these volumes a sad defect in a quality capital and essential in the leader of a reform, the faculty of a large human sympathy that can truly comprehend and candidly appreciate the position of those differing from or opposed to himself, a kindly social tact or consciousness, that could in such case put him in another's place, — the place of the alleged wrong-doer as well as wrong-sufferer, — and look out from his standpoint; that could in case of dissent take view from the position of the dissenter, and from it estimate the moral quality of his opinions or actions, and not from a disagreement of sentiment infer of necessity a perversity of will or a corruption of principle. Such a faculty is of vital importance to the reformer in various ways. To drive the devil out of the house of the soul you must first be able yourself to enter into it. In order to persuade and win a people you must be able to find them where they are and as they are. You must be able to comprehend them, and enter into their feelings, reasonings, impulses, opinions, and prejudices.

Mr. Garrison's sympathies were undoubtedly quick and strong in certain directions, but in others quite defective, wanting in breadth and catholicity and faculty of just judgment. Certainly this faculty seemed sadly to fail him both in dealing with those whom he arraigned for wrongs to be redressed, and with friends and co-laborers who differed from him in theory or method of action. Opinionative by nature, his self-confidence seemed to have grown upon him from often seeing his plans or opinions, first asserted by him in the face of adverse majorities, afterwards vindicated by results, or their acceptance by doubters yielded to his superior energy of will; insomuch that it at last becomes an intolerance of dissent from any quarter, ready even in case of the best, oldest, most tried and trusted friends and benefactors of himself and the cause, to construe it into willful stupidity, cowardice, unworthy ambition, or recreancy to principle.

Nothing is sadder in Garrison's life than the alienation thus arising between him and his old friends, many of them amongst the purest and noblest men of their times. Nothing could be more obstructive of the reform he prosecuted than the attitude in which these qualities of character at last placed him to many of the truest, wisest, saintliest, and most loved men of the period, in church and state, and in the ranks of Christian philanthropy and public beneficence. It gradually bred in him a feeling of antagonism towards civil and ecclesiastical organizations generally,

and ultimately led to pessimistic views of the existing order of the world, — the views which abjured its civil governments as anti-Christian, and the churches as for the most part apostasies and shams. It was little wonder, then, that the Constitution of the United States, with its compromises with slavery, though entered into by our fathers as temporary and in expectation of the speedy abolition of the evil it refused to name, and under the stress of the vital necessity of a national Union, — it is little wonder, nevertheless, that it was denounced by him emphatically as nothing less than “a covenant with hell.”

We see in the case of Mr. Garrison how readily the reformer passes to the iconoclast; how in contending with the organic sins of a people he is tempted at last to seek the destruction of the organizations in which they inhere and have their growth, and kills life itself in attempting to destroy that which kills it; and how the loss of reverence for institutions to which society has committed the guardianship of its truth and honor, but which he finds full of unreasonable, ignorant, and corrupt men, may end at last in an attack on social order itself.

This alien or antagonistic position of Mr. Garrison towards organized institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, was most unfortunate in various directions. It alarmed the conservative element, and produced a popular distrust of himself and his cause. It also tended to alienate or neutralize organizations to which society had committed and adjusted itself, and which, however adulterated with a mixture of evil, selfish, or false members, yet embraced the noblest, truest, wisest, and best element society had, and that on which it must mainly rely for the accomplishment of beneficent reforms.

It is the part of the truly model reformer, in regard to those organisms into which society has ultimately cast itself, after the experience of ages, for its preservation or for power of action and progress, if they are imperfect or faulty, to seek rather to reform than destroy, and, like Christ, be not in haste to burn up the temple because of the money-changers that have crept in, nor to scuttle the ship bearing a precious cargo of life and treasure on the high seas because ignoramuses or traitors are for the hour at the helm, or cowards or mutineers are amongst the crew. Especially will he not abjure civil government, legislation, and the ballot when he is in struggle to overthrow an evil which, having been created by these agencies, can be abolished only by the same without revolutionary force and bloodshed. He will certainly be slow,

in reforming and refitting our House of Civil Life, to pull down its substantial defense and shelter of legal ordinance, thinking to roof it over with cloud and star-light and buttress it round by moonbeams of a dreamy, visionary philosophy. Nor will he be likely to accept what seems to have been the outcome of Mr. Garrison's latest speculations on perfectionism, non-resistance, non-enforcement of law, and the anti-Christian character of existing civil or ecclesiastical systems, — the theory that the removal of a single great wrong created and upheld only by positive civil enactment is to be accomplished only through a universal crusade of moral and religious reform; that the way to the "*immediate*" abolition of slavery lies only through the achievement of the millennium, and that the *instantaneous* breaking of all fetters means waiting their decay in a new moral atmosphere of the renovated world.

Defects like those above indicated in Garrison's leadership in the anti-slavery reform were more or less apparent in the early and heroic period of his public career, and were seriously obstructive and much deplored, but they were for the time condoned to his intense earnestness and heroic intrepidity and in view of his shameful wrongs, the meanness and malice of his foes, and the wonderful progress of his movement, which by many was construed into a practical justification of his spirit and method. They were thus condoned, though widely recognized, until, in the second period, with their fuller development, their mischiefs culminated in a schism in the anti-slavery body itself.

Our judgment upon Mr. Garrison's course at this time respects not the question of his liberty of thought and utterance, or of the truth or falsehood of what he uttered, but the unwisdom of announcing or advocating divisive theories in that crisis. The anti-slavery party had become large, widely extended, and of manifold constituency. It had now become a matter of first necessity by all means not compromising principle to keep its members united, and to hold them — all minor differences being subordinated, or for the time in abeyance — in steadfast concentration on the one great end, which then transcended all others in its vital relations to country, society, civilization, and Christianity. Nothing could mark unwise leadership more than the introduction at this crisis of new issues or reforms not essential to the main one, and inviting dissension and antagonism into the anti-slavery ranks, or the obtrusion, amid a constituency diverse in creeds, schools and political and ecclesiastical parties, of speculations and

theories which directly assailed their distinctive tenets and set them at variance among themselves and with the Anti-Slavery Society.

Especially was it the highest wisdom and duty to forbear broaching and advocating theories that to the multitude might seem subversive of the existing social and ecclesiastical order of the world; theories which abjured allegiance to civil government and the exercise of the legislative or elective franchise, and thus shut off recourse to political methods through which alone the desired reform could hope to be achieved without revolutionary violence.

Nor did it matter much on what platform or through what press Mr. Garrison spoke. The known public acceptance and advocacy of such theories, whether in the "Liberator" or elsewhere, by him who was in the eyes of the multitude the chief and well-nigh the embodiment of the anti-slavery cause, would inevitably identify it in public view with those doctrines, and cumber it with the odium popularly attaching to them. The friends of the cause naturally felt it would sink under the accumulated opprobrium or perish by the manifold discords thus brought upon it. To obviate the necessity of a separation, some of the ablest, wisest, and most true-hearted friends of Mr. Garrison and the cause endeavored by letters embraced in these volumes, — letters which seem to us to be marked by great friendliness and vigorous good sense, — to point out to Mr. Garrison the injurious tendencies of his course and persuade him to a change. It was vain, and the schism was inevitable.

Nothing is sadder than now to mark his changed characterization of many of those compelled to fall away from him, — many for years the staunchest, most devoted, most generous, and most lauded of friends and patrons and most steadfast and self-sacrificing in the common cause. Selfish, ambitious, cowardly motives are promptly imputed to them. "Recreancy," "bigotry," "sectarianism," "intrigue," "cabal," and "sedition" are the terms liberally applied to their course. It is melancholy to find among those thus compelled to withdraw from the old anti-slavery leader and society such names as Whittier, Sewall, Elizur Wright, Lundy, William Goodell, Arthur Tappan, Lewis Tappan, James G. Birney, Amos A. Phelps, Stanton, and multitudes of similar grand and loyal record. We feel there must have been much of nobility and personal magnetism in a man that could group such a circle of friends around him and hold them so long, while at the same time we the more painfully regret the impracticable self-will and intol-



erance of dissent, the mistakes that refused to be counseled, and the haste to sinister construction and harsh censure of disagreement, that finally resulted in their separation.

But the separation seemed timely and to have saved the cause. The segments thus falling off entered into new associations, some of them with decided political aims, and with issues in which the South, ultimately defeated at the ballot box, lit up the flames of the civil war, to see at last the colossal iniquity which she championed consumed in the conflagration herself had kindled.

If now we inquire after the service rendered by Garrison to this result we are referred chiefly to the first period. There his most heroic and effective work was done. The impulse then given, though in a measure interrupted and retarded, was not broken by the schism of the party. It had struck too deep and strong ever to perish. None of the segments into which the original movement had divided became recreant to its great primordial principle. Rather each claimed that its own way best vindicated it. All were swept along in one great current like the conflicting eddies on the tide that bears to the Niagara. The primal agitation rolled on like some vast underswell of the ocean smitten by tempests, beneath surface billows wrought by gusty winds.

That impulse was in the Kansas imbroglio and the election of Lincoln, and in the magnificent uprising of the North at the call of country, union, and liberty to defend the national life against the sword of rebellion. Rebellion meant slavery, and national life meant human freedom. The anti-slavery current was the deepest of the tides that moved on the civil war. Dear was "The Star Spangled Banner," but

"John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave,  
But his soul goes marching on,"

was the mighty Marseillaise which swayed the armies of Liberty as the forest or ocean is swayed under the solemn march of the storm-wind.

It is as giving mastering force if not origin to that impulse that lasting fame attaches to Garrison's name in the overthrow of American Slavery. Other things will, with time, fall away from him, fading more and more out of history, — his perfectionism, non-resistance, his Sabbatarian and theologic idiosyncrasies, his renunciation of civil government, of the elective franchise and the enforcement of the law, and of church organizations and visible forms of worship, together with his dreams of a millennial era, in which wrongs, existent by form of law, shall spontaneously

dissolve and vanish away without legislative reform,—these and the like speculations and theories may drift out of sight, among the phantoms of the past; but his early heroic attitude in a death-grapple with the great evil of the age, the octopus of slavery, grasping and strangling our American liberty, civilization, and Christianity with its deadly tentacles,—this will hardly be forgotten while the stars and stripes float over an enfranchised empire.

History places in her Valhalla no monoliths, lives entire and all of a piece, nor those completely and minutely depicted, but lives glimpsed at their loftiest, noblest, and best. This she must do in dealing with imperfect men, or she can have no Hall of Heroes. She idealizes, not idolizes. The heroic attitude and action (as in the roll of heroes in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews) she idealizes, to a personality representative of the special virtue therein illustrated, and holds it up to fashion to nobler life and manhood the coming ages. For idols she will call in the iconoclast. To the heroic life she will condone much. Over much she will drop the mantle of oblivion. On what is brightest and best she will fix her longest look; and as the sapphire and chrysolite of the loftiest mountain peaks kindling in the sunset are seen latest by the receding voyager over the ocean waves, while the unsightliness and disorder of their bases sink in shadow or fall below the horizon, so the heroic life will be looked at longest and latest where it climbs highest into heaven.

*T. M. Post.*

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

---

### A STURDY CHRISTIAN.

THE author of that charming little book "*Obiter Dicta*" has lately been writing in an English periodical about Dr. Samuel Johnson. It would hardly be possible to imagine a greater contrast than that which exists between the great lexicographer's methods of thought and expression and those of the graceful essayist. The former moves with all the ponderous dignity of an antique three-decker, while the latter is as light and swift as a modern yacht. And yet I think that Johnson has seldom found a more appreciative and sympathetic student of his life and character than this latest critic. He does not admire so pro-

fusely and enthusiastically as Boswell, but he admires with more discrimination. And that is certainly the most valuable quality in admiration, for it is not subject to the qualms of reaction.

For one thing I am especially grateful to this fascinating writer: that he has put me upon thinking more seriously of Johnson's religious character. And it appears to me a subject which will repay considerable study. There is hardly any among the great men of history who can be called so emphatically and distinctively "a man of letters," undoubtedly none who has won so high a personal position and so large a contemporary influence by sheer strength of pen. The literary life is not generally considered to be especially favorable to the cultivation of piety; and Johnson's peculiar circumstances were not of a kind to make it more favorable in his case than usual. He was poor, neglected, struggling during a great part of his career against the heaviest odds. His natural disposition was by no means such as to predispose him to religion. He was afflicted from childhood with a hypochondriac and irritable humor; a proud, domineering spirit, housed in an unwieldy and disordered body; plagued by inordinate physical appetites; inclined not unnaturally to rely with overconfidence upon the strength and accuracy of his reasoning powers; driven by his impetuous temper into violent assertion and bitter controversy; deeply wounded by his long years of obscurity, and highly elated by his final success,—he was certainly not one whom we would select as likely to be a remarkably religious man. Carlyle had less to embitter him. Goethe had no more to self-deify him. And yet, beyond a doubt, Samuel Johnson was a sincere, an humble, and, in the main, a consistent Christian.

Of course, we cannot help seeing that his peculiarities and faults affected his religion. He was intolerant and overbearing in his expression of theological views to a degree which seems almost ludicrous. We may, perhaps, keep a straight face and a respectful attitude when we see him turning his back on the Abbé Raynal, and refusing to "shake hands with an infidel." But when he exclaims in regard to a young lady who had left the Church of England to become a Quaker, "I hate the wench and shall ever hate her; I hate all impudence of a chit; apostasy I nauseate;" and when he answers the gently expressed hope of a friend that he and the girl should meet, after all, in a blessed eternity, by saying, "Madam, I am not fond of *meeting fools anywhere*," we cannot help joining in the general laughter of the com-

pany to whom he speaks ; and as the Doctor himself finally laughs and becomes cheerful and entertaining, we feel that it was only the bear in him that growled, — an honest beast, but sometimes very surly.

As for his very remarkable strictures upon Presbyterianism, his declaration that he preferred the Roman Catholic Church, his expressed hope that John Knox was buried in the highway, and his wish that a dangerous steeple in Edinburgh might not be taken down because if it were let alone it might fall on some of the posterity of John Knox, which, he said, would be "no great matter;" when we remember that he was talking to his fatuous friend Boswell, we get a new idea of the depth as well as the audacity of the great man's humor. He never could resist the temptation to take a rise out of a fool, although he loved him well ; and I believe he even stirred up his natural high-churchism to rise rampant and roar most vigorously, for the pleasure of seeing Boswell's eyes stand out, and his neat little pigtail vibrate in mild dismay.

There are many other sayings of Johnson's which disclose a deeper vein of tolerance ; such as that remark about the essential agreement and trivial differences of all Christians, and his warm commendation, on his dying bed, of the sermons of Dr. Samuel Clarke.

But even suppose that we were forced to admit that Dr. Johnson was lacking in that polished liberality, that willingness to admit that every other man's opinions were as good as his own, which we have come nowadays to regard as the chief of the theological virtues ; even suppose that we must call him "narrow," — (how it makes one shiver to think of saying it to his face!) — it seems to me that we must admit at the same time that he was "deep;" he had a profundity of conviction, a solidity of faith, a sincerity of utterance, which made his religion something, as the Germans say, "to take hold of with your hands." He was a sturdy Christian.

And he had need to be. With that tempestuous, unruly disposition of his boiling all the time within him, living in the age of Chesterfield and Bolingbroke, fighting his way through the world amid a thousand difficulties and temptations, he had great need to get a firm grip upon the realities of religion and hold fast to them as things that were settled. His first conviction of the truth of Christianity came to him while he was at Oxford, through a casual reading of Law's "Call to the Unconverted." There were some

years after that, he tells us, when he was totally regardless of religion. But sickness and trouble brought it back, "and I hope," says he, "that I have never lost it since." He did not regard it as a matter to be continually questioned, but as a principle to be honestly and consistently carried out. He committed himself solidly to that view of the universe, to that rule of life, which he found in the New Testament; and he endeavored sincerely to cultivate in himself, and to commend to others, the practice of piety and the Christian virtues.

He was not unwilling to converse with his friends at fitting opportunities in regard to religious subjects, and I do not think that any one who heard him could have remained long in doubt as to the nature of his convictions. There was one conversation in particular, on the subject of the sacrifice of Christ, at the close of which he solemnly dictated to his friend a brief statement of his views, saying finally, "The peculiar doctrine of Christianity is that of an universal sacrifice and a perpetual propitiation. Other prophets only proclaimed the will and the threatenings of God. Christ satisfied his justice." And again, one calm, bright Sunday afternoon, when he was in a boat with some friends upon the sea (I think it was during his journey to the Hebrides), he fell into discourse with Boswell about the fear of death, which was often very terrible to his mind. He would not admit that the close of life ought to be regarded with cheerfulness or indifference, or that a rational man should be as willing to leave the world as to go out of a show-room after he has seen it. "No, sir," said he, with great solemnity, "there is no rational principle by which a man can die contented, but a trust in the mercy of God through the merits of Jesus Christ." I profess that I should like to have heard the great man speaking after this fashion. It was not only soundly orthodox; it was also wonderfully candid; and of the two qualities I know not which to admire more. He was not afraid to say that he was afraid to die. He assumed no braggadocio before the grave. He was honest with himself, and he felt that he needed all the fortitude of a religious faith to meet the hour of dissolution and the prospect of divine judgment without flinching. And in this, also, he was a Christian of a different type from that which prevails at present; for now men saunter as unconcernedly and airily towards the day of judgment as if they were going to the play.

But Dr. Johnson was not by any means given to unseasonable or unreasonable religious discourse. He had a holy horror of cant,

and of unprofitable controversy with scoffers or unbelievers. He once said of a friend who was more loquacious than discreet, "Why, yes, sir; he will introduce religious discourse without seeing whether it will end in instruction and improvement, or produce some profane jest. He would introduce it in the company of Wilkes, and twenty more *such*." What a keen insight into character, what a solid weight of common sense there is in that little word *such*!

It was Dr. Johnson's custom to keep a book of "Prayers and Meditations" for his own private use. These were printed after his death, and they reveal to us the beauty and sincerity of his inner life as nothing else could do. Think of the old man kneeling down in his room before he began the painful labors of a studious day, and repeating this prayer:—

*"Against inquisitive and perplexing thoughts. O Lord, my Maker and Protector, who hast graciously sent me into this world to work out my salvation, enable me to drive from me all such unquiet and perplexing thoughts as may mislead or hinder me in the practice of those duties which Thou hast required. When I behold the works of thy hands, and consider the course of thy providence, give me grace always to remember that thy thoughts are not my thoughts, nor thy ways my ways. And while it shall please Thee to continue me in this world, where much is to be done and little to be known, teach me by thy Holy Spirit to withdraw my mind from unprofitable and dangerous inquiries, from difficulties vainly curious, and doubts impossible to be solved. Let me rejoice in the light which Thou hast imparted; let me serve Thee with active zeal and humble confidence, and wait with patient expectation for the time in which the soul Thou receivest shall be satisfied with knowledge. Grant this, O Lord, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."*

These are honest and sensible petitions for every man who desires to pass the rest of his life quietly and profitably according to Christ Jesus. And the more a man knows, the more devoted he is to serious and difficult studies, the more he ought to feel the need of just such a divine defense and guidance as Johnson prayed for. It is a good thing to be kept on the track. It is a wise thing to mistrust your own doubts. It is a happy thing to be delivered from them.

The fundamental quality of Dr. Johnson's religion was the sense of reverence. He was never "known to utter the name of God but on proper occasions and with due respect." He ap-



proached the consideration of divine things with genuine solemnity, and could not tolerate sacred trifling or pious profanity. He always prepared himself with care to participate in the Holy Communion, and maintained a decorous and humble demeanor in the house of God. He was not ashamed to kneel where men could see him, although he never courted their notice, or to pray where men could hear him, although he did not desire their approbation any more than he feared their ridicule.

There were grave faults and errors in his conduct. But no one had so keen a sense of their guilt and unworthiness as the man himself, who was bravely fighting against them, and sincerely lamenting their recurrence. They often tripped him up and humiliated him, but they never got him completely down. He righted himself again and went lumbering heavily on. He never sold his heart to a lie, never confused the evil and the good. When he sinned he knew it and despised himself. It gives us a delightful confidence in his sincerity when we see him denying himself the use of wine because he was naturally prone to excess, and yet admitting it to his friends who were able to use it temperately. He was no Pharisee; and, on the other hand, he was no slipshod condoner of vice or suave preacher of moral indifference. He was a great, big, honest soul, trying hard to live straight along the line of duty, and to do good as he found opportunity.

The kindness and generosity of his heart were known to few save his intimate friends, and not always appreciated even by those who had most cause to be grateful to him. The poor broken-down pensioners with whom he filled his house in later years, and to whom he alluded playfully as his *seraglio*, were a constant source of annoyance. They grumbled perpetually and fought like so many cats. But he would not cast them off any more than he would turn out his favorite mouser, Hodge, for whom he used to "go out and buy oysters, lest the servants having that trouble should take a dislike to the poor creature." He gave away by far the larger part of his income in charity, and, what was still more generous, devoted a considerable portion of his time to counseling young and unsuccessful authors and *reading their manuscripts*. Think of that, and wonder at the blessed effects of piety and Christian kindness.

I suppose that if one had been a poverty-stricken beginner at literature, in London of the eighteenth century, the best thing that one could have done would have been to find the way to Dr. Samuel Johnson's house and tell him how the case stood. If he

himself had no money to lend one, he would have borrowed it from some of his friends. And if he could not say anything encouraging about the manuscripts, he would have been frank enough to advise the unhappy aspirant for fame to prefer the life of a competent shoemaker to that of an incompetent scribbler.

Much of what was best in the character of Johnson came out in his friendships. He was as good as a lover as he was as a hater. He was loyal to a fault, and honest, though never extravagant, in his admirations. The picture of the old man in his last illness, surrounded by the friends whom he had cherished so faithfully, and who now delighted to testify their respect and affection for him, and brighten his lingering days with every attention, has little of the customary horror of a death-bed. And it is strange indeed that he who had always been subject to such a dread of dying should have found it possible to meet the hour of dissolution with such courage and composure. His old friend Sir Joshua Reynolds comes in to bid him farewell, and Johnson makes three requests of him,—to forgive him thirty pounds which he had borrowed of him, to read the Bible, and never to use his pencil on a Sunday. Good petitions, which Sir Joshua readily granted, although we cannot help fearing that he occasionally forgot the last.

"Tell me," says the sick man to his physician, "can I possibly recover? Give me a direct answer." Being hard pressed, Dr. Brocklesby confesses that in his opinion recovery is out of the question. "Then," says Johnson, "I will take no more physick, not even my opiates: for I have prayed that I may render up my soul to God unclouded."

And so with kind and thoughtful words to his servant, and a "God bless you, my dear" to the young daughter of a friend who stood lingering at the door of his room, this sturdy old Christian went out to meet the God whom he had tried so honestly to serve. Three things he left behind him,—the fame of a great writer; the untarnished honor of a gentleman; and an unshaken testimony of faith in the religion of Jesus Christ.

*Henry J. van Dyke, Jr.*

NEW YORK CITY.

## THE POSSIBILITIES OF RELIGIOUS REFORM IN ITALY.

### III. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH.

IN 1860, when the Baron Bettino Ricasoli was Governor General of Tuscany, — then just become part of the new kingdom of Italy, — application was made to him for permission to open an American chapel in Florence. He refused to give this permission in form, on the ground that to do this was to assert the right to withhold it; whereas he contended that freedom of conscience and freedom of worship in accordance with conscience were inherent rights of all, and that they were, as such, secured to every one by the Sardinian Constitution, then the law of the land.

When, on the death of Cavour in June, 1861, this same Baron Ricasoli was called to the government, he defined his politico-ecclesiastical policy as one which should "provide the means, and open to the Church the way of self-reformation," which should give to it "at once the power and the incentive to regenerate itself." Let it be granted that the words "the Church" may not have here been used in emphasized antithesis to the papacy, yet, none the less, they were no doubt deliberately selected; and the baron's subsequent course is warrant that he then spoke of the self-reformation of the *Church*, quite regardless of the question of what bearing such a reformation might have upon the papacy.

The liberal teaching of the Theological School of Pavia, reorganized upon very enlightened principles by the Emperor Joseph II., and the influence of its great master-mind Tamburini, had not been without lasting result. The career of Bishop Scipio de' Ricci, and the story of the reforming Synod of Pistoia in 1786, and of the Ecclesiastical Assembly of Florence in 1787, both under the protection of the Grand Duke Peter Leopold, had not been forgotten. Rosmini's "Cinque Piaghe," published in 1846, was such a confession of the necessity of reform in our own times as could not but be profoundly felt.<sup>1</sup> The "Conferences" of the Padre Ventura, whether heard in Paris in 1851, or afterwards read in Italy, moved very many hearers and readers to unwonted self-searchings for the Church as well as for themselves.

A few illustrations of the effect of such teachings may be cited, dating prior to 1861.

<sup>1</sup> An American edition of this remarkable work, with an Introduction for which we are indebted to Canon Liddon, was published by E. P. Dutton, 1883.

1. A politico-ecclesiastical controversy between Sig. *Sciottopintor*, a magistrate of Cagliari and member of the Sardinian Parliament (and afterwards Senator of Italy), and his bishop, begun as early as 1850, had run on ever since, bringing upon the former the major excommunication, and from him a succession of very trenchant pamphlets. The ecclesiastical tone of these can be inferred from such language as: "Christ alone the head of the Church;" "the infallibility of the pontiff, a doctrine heretical, injurious to the Creator, absurd and degrading to the flock;" and "the Catholic doctrine is that the Church is infallible; the Church being the Pope, with the entire episcopate and with the learned theologians, ecclesiastical or lay, of all Christendom."

2. Monsignore *Pietro Emilio Tiboni*, a learned Hebraist of the Faculty of Padua, and Canon of Brescia, in 1853, contrary to the prohibition of the Paduan Curia, published a volume of over 600 pages on the Principles of Biblical Hermeneutics, which brought upon him the severe censures of the "Civiltà Cattolica," and cost him his position of President of the Cathedral Seminary of Brescia. To these censures Mons. Tiboni promptly printed a Response, which was, however, seized in the hands of the printer, and sequestered for eight years by the Venetian ecclesiastical authority, under civil, that is, Austrian sanction.

3. In 1857 a certain *Pietro Mongini*, the parish priest of Oggebbio on the Lago Maggiore, published a Project for a *Società di Mutuo Soccorso del Clero*, professedly aimed only at such mutual support in their poverty as would give the priesthood greater independence, better education, more self-respect and manliness, and a larger influence and moral power, but plainly designed also to be a defense under ecclesiastical pressure and persecution. The author was forced from his parish in consequence of this proposal and of other equally imprudent utterances. Such societies of priests sprung up, none the less, in various parts of Italy, notably in Tuscany in 1860 and in South Italy, after the Garibaldian conquest. Bishop *Michele Caputo*, of Ariano, Chaplain General of the forces of the former kingdom of the Two Sicilies, accepted the honorary presidency of such a society in Naples.

The issues which separated these societies from the authorities of the Church were, indeed, at first only or chiefly political, but those priests who, in that period of revolution, dared to hold with their king and country rather than with the Vatican, to be Italians first and papal Catholics afterwards, were, for the most

part, precisely those who would be far more ready than their brethren to think freely for themselves also on moral or even on ecclesiastical and religious questions. The Naples society early in 1861—at once upon the fall of Gaeta and the meeting of the first *Italian* Parliament—began the publication of a paper, "*La Colonna di Fuoco*," as the organ of their demand for the separation of the civil from the ecclesiastical papacy, the temporal from the spiritual power.

4. A somewhat similar *Società Ecclesiastica* was, in 1859, organized in Milan, whose simple design was declared to be "to promote among its members the cultivation of religious studies, especially those which have a practical influence on the social welfare of the people."

5. In the same year the Count *Ottavio Tasca*, a Bergamaso nobleman, returning to the remnant of his confiscated estates after a ten years' exile in England, engaged in efforts to make his neighbors sharers in the spiritual truths he had gathered from the English Church, and also to minister, in body and in spirit, to the wounded soldiers of the war of independence of that year, who had been intrusted to his care as honorary Inspector General of the military hospitals of Lombardy. Count Tasca was sustained in this catholic work, more or less, by the Anglo-Continental Society, whose publications were, by this time, in limited circulation in Italy; while three or four English or American Churchmen, from about this time, came into personal contact not only with the *Evangelici*, as already recounted, but occasionally with such Italian reformers of a more conservative type.

These and other such instances were very significant of what was coming. Indeed, enough evidence of such an interest in and preparedness for reform had, in these and in such like ways, been given to prompt the Lower House in the Convocation of Canterbury of the Church of England, on February 28, 1861, on motion of Archdeacon Wordsworth, to send up to the Bishops a petition, submitting to their consideration "whether it might not be expedient" to set forth an address to the clergy and laity of Italy on the subject of the catholic reformation of their ancient Church.

But the above quoted language of Baron Ricasoli may yet fairly be regarded as the first formal Italian recognition of the public necessity of reform in the Church of Italy. Cavour had, indeed, already said, "A free Church in a free State;" but Ricasoli was the first Italian statesman to realize that a Church of Italy to be truly free, to be so free as to be capable of harmonious coördi-

nation with a free State of Italy, must be reformed; in other words, that Catholic reformation was a corollary of Italian political regeneration. His, therefore, were the words which gave the virtual signal for that very remarkable movement among Italian Churchmen which awakened a warm interest in England and in this country from twenty-five to ten years ago, but which was then and is yet very rarely understood.

The time had not come for *action* in that sense. For any religious revolution that proposed to organize itself wholly outside of the Italian Church and in open hostility to it, it was, of course, enough that political events had given freedom of conscience to Italy. For any efforts to induce or to provoke a self-reformation of the papal system, the time was, of course, as ripe as it was ever likely to be. But for a Catholic reform of the Church itself, to be carried on *within* the Church, in loyalty to the Church as such, although based upon a transformation, or even upon the dissolution of the Roman papacy, the time had *not* come. It was surely coming.

Before September 20, 1870, the time had fully come only for the question of the *temporal* power. Since that date, it has come for gradually undermining the *spiritual* supremacy of the See of Rome. When that also shall have been accomplished, *then* the time will have come for actual ecclesiastical and religious reforms. Divine Providence works very deliberately in human history. We, who are so easily satisfied with superficial results, are impatient. Those who would be co-workers with God must be willing to advance stage by stage, nay, step by step. They must be patient as well as trustful. The time had not then come, either before or immediately after the Vatican Council, for actual reform in the Church. It had come, however, for examination, for meditation, for preparation. It had come for the dispersion of ignorance, for the emancipation of the enshackled conscience, for the broadening of the sympathies, for the growth of larger views, for the disentangling of principles, for the distinct and full recognition of the purpose set in view. It had come, in other words, for the education of the agents by whom and for the clear understanding of the means and methods through which that transformation and that reform were to be brought about. If one generation should so faithfully and so thoroughly do its own work of such preparation, that the time for actual Catholic reform might come in the next, it was all that should have been asked or expected. While, therefore, a foreign proselyting policy might consistently ask for early



results, such as they were, and while a D' Andrea was and a Curci is — however hopeless their own ecclesiastical theories — necessary "reformers before a reformation," a Christian churchmanship which hopes for and seeks a Catholic reform in the Italian Church itself, based upon such a dissolution of the papal system, can only, by a self-stultifying impatience and inconsistency, look for organic results while this absolutely essential work of preparation is yet going on.

For this *preparatory* work, however, the times *were* ripe and the instruments at hand, and the ecclesiastical policy of the Ricasoli ministry of 1861 gave an immediate impulse to that work.

A notable echo to the baron's words was soon heard from one singularly fitted to be such an instrument; to be, indeed, the exponent of inchoate catholic reform principles for the period preceding the Council of the Vatican, one of whom I hope to speak much more fully at some other time, — Professor *Stanislao Bianciardi*, of Florence, a successful educator, a fine linguist, a writer of fresh, racy and idiomatic Tuscan, a patriot by conviction, and a devout Catholic of the nobler type. A neighbor from boyhood and a political friend of Ricasoli, that statesman had called Bianciardi to his aid in the political education of the people of Tuscany for the revolution of 1859-60; and to his pamphlets the baron largely attributed the steady and intelligent popular support accorded him at that time.

At once, upon the accession of the Ricasoli ministry, this Bianciardi began the publication of what was designed to be a "History of the Popes," but which never advanced beyond the first volume. In the Introduction, however, the author expressed himself concerning his purpose and the necessity of reform in the Church in language which was at that time as rare as it was frank and timely.

"I believe," said he on the one hand, "that without truly catholic religion we shall never see Italy rise to a true, recognized and lasting greatness." But he added on the other: "With all my heart I desire, in the Catholic Church, a reform or a renovation which shall restore it to its own ancient simplicity and purity, and which shall harmonize it with the genius and needs of us Italians."

"The foundations of the Catholic religion," he continues, "without speaking of the gospel, — which is, in short, the solid rock upon which the unshaken superstructure all rests, — were laid with admirable solidity by the holy Fathers of the golden age of Christianity; and it is beyond a doubt that, without wounding Catholic

dogma, — nay, taking it in its primitive purity as a guide, — all those abuses which, promoted, favored or tolerated by the Roman Curia, have so greatly injured the cause of true religion in the opinion of the good, might be utterly swept away. Had not the greater part of us, either from supine ignorance or from a deplorably superficial education, or indeed too often through the false strategy of controversy, strangely confounded two things, distinct one from the one and often mutually opposed, — the *Catholic religion*, the *Curia Romana*, — we would not have seen, and we would not yet see, a war of base hostility, interrupted by false truces and almost impossible to end with honorable peace.”

The writer then specifies what are “commonly held to be the most important sources of the evils which are the practical outcome of the very essence of Catholicism.” Of these, — “The Infallibility and domination of the Pope; Confession; The Mass; Worship of the Saints; The Celibacy of the Priests; Prohibition, direct or indirect, express or tacit, of reading the Word of God,” — he speaks with equal frankness and moderation, declaring of the first: “Nor of this pretended infallibility and supremacy are any traces to be seen in the first five centuries.” And again: “It was sought to establish the feudal system in the Church, placing at its head the Roman pontiff. . . . The feudal system has fallen, but the abuses which sprang from it yet endure.”

Nor was Professor Bianciardi by any means the only one to come forward now, each with his own indictment of the *Roman Catholicism* of the times, with his testimony to the purer standards of truly Catholic antiquity by which it should be judged, or with his own confession of the grave necessity of reform. Monsignore Tiboni published, in 1861, his “*Secolarizzazione della Bibbia*,” an able and exhaustive historic review of the evidence that the Bible was intended for the use, the study, and the guidance of every one, and the standard by which the teaching of the Church should be tried; and, in 1862, two discourses upon the *Curia Romana* and Papal Infallibility. Padre *Cristoforo Coppola*, of Naples, published, also in 1861, two volumes of over 200 octavo pages each, upon the abuses which had grown up in the sacramental system and in the moral practice of the Church, and the reforms necessary to restore the Church to its own original. *Filippo Perfetti*, ex-secretary to Cardinal Merini, and now professor in the University of Perugia, — already known as an eloquent and philosophic writer, — published, in 1862, a very striking brochure, “*Il Clero e la Società*,” on the relations of the clergy to

society. About this time, also, *Eusebio Reali*, Canon of the Lateran at Rome, published in Turin a pamphlet in which he maintained that adhesion to the temporal power of the Pope was no part of the Catholic faith, and that on this subject a good Catholic enjoyed entire liberty of conscience. For this he was expelled from his order, and even hardly escaped from Rome to Siena, where he was appointed to a chair of Canon Law in the University. In a subsequent pamphlet he insisted that membership of the Society of Jesus should be declared a civil crime. Senator Sciottopintor and Parroco Mongini now threw themselves anew into their respective controversies; and several names of lesser note were, at the time, heard of in similar connection. It was at this time, moreover, that Cardinal D' Andrea came first into collision with the Jesuit faction in the Roman court; it was in the following spring that Passaglia drew up his Letter to Pius IX. and obtained his nine thousand signatures; and it was in 1862 that Count Mamiani published his "*Rinascenza Cattolica*,"—all which have been recounted in a former article.

About this time, also, certain of the bolder priests of the Naples *Società di Mutuo Soccorso*, having been placed by their Bishop-President in charge of some of the royal chapels (that is, the chapels of the monastic orders which, on their suppression, had reverted in the Crown) for the Lenten courses, preached vigorously the necessity of reform in Church morals and discipline, using, in common with the "*Colonna*," the words Romanism and Catholicism contradistinctively, and calling for a "return of the Church to primitive Catholicity." The death of Bishop Caputo, in September, 1862, deprived the society of a protector. The bishops of the Neapolitan provinces united in denunciation of the "*Colonna*," which was, consequently, soon discontinued and the society itself dissolved. A small number of its members, however, among whom was Padre Coppola, at once reorganized under the leadership of a young Dominican monk, *Luigi Prota*, one of the ablest and most daring of the Lent preachers of the previous spring. The new society took the name of the *Emancipation Society*, and Padre Prota promptly began the publication of a new journal, "*L' Emancipatore Cattolico*." This society continued its existence, and Padre Prota maintained his stand and published this paper, through every vicissitude, during the entire period now under review. The catholicity of the sturdy Padre's positive principles, whether theological or ecclesiastical, was, however, scarcely equal to the tenacity with which he stood his ground

against the authorities of the Church; and, in December, 1869, he consented to take a somewhat prominent part in a proposed Anti-Council, called to protest against that of the Vatican on the basis of the barest humanitarian rationalism. However ably, he carried on the contest, moreover, on low moral and spiritual grounds, and, therefore, neither did Prota, his society, nor his paper secure general or cordial recognition as among the truer *catholic* reformers of the church of Italy.

From this society, then, the reformers of Northern and Central Italy stood quite apart. But not only so; however numerous the instances and striking the language of those, whether priests or laymen, who were now encouraged to speak out, they were even yet so many separate and isolated personalities. There was no common bond uniting them. There was, in no sense, either a *party* or a *movement*.

It was under these circumstances that the Church of England appeared on the ground and among these reformers in the person of the late learned and loving Christopher Wordsworth, then Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster (afterwards Bishop of Lincoln), who made, in this summer of 1862, a tour of six weeks in Italy, visiting Milan, Florence, Rome, Genoa and Turin, for the express purpose of studying these phenomena. During this visit, Dr. Wordsworth gathered a large amount of information concerning the ecclesiastical state of Italy at that time, which he afterwards recorded and discussed in the two valuable volumes of his "Tour in Italy." He came also into personal relations with some of those who advocated Catholic reform, and gave an emphatic illustration of the principle which had, from the first, and which has ever since, governed the representatives of the Church of England and of the American Episcopal Church in their intercourse with reformers of this class, namely, that while all sympathy should be shown and every assistance rendered to sustain them in their efforts to promote reform within their Church in accordance with their own principles and on their own responsibility, — yet that no effort should be made either to induce Italians to separate from their Church or to acquire the responsible control or even the guidance of their work.

Canon Wordsworth was, in this policy, most faithfully followed by the Rev. L. M. Hogg, an English clergyman who had for some years been familiar and deeply interested in Italian religious questions, and who had a genius for winning the confidence even of strangers and for acquiring out-of-the-way information. Real-

izing that what was most needed was some influence, some bond which could unite the now scattered representatives of Catholic reform principles, Mr. Hogg projected a periodical, something between a newspaper and a magazine, which should be the exponent of those principles, and the organ of the Catholic reformers in the critical and preparatory stage of their inchoate reform. For this the name of "*Esaminatore*" presented itself as appropriate. He obtained the means from some generous English and Irish friends, and meeting with Bianciardi's Introduction to the "*History of the Popes*," he sought him and offered him the editorial charge of such a periodical.

Bianciardi gratefully accepted the trust. The "*Esaminatore*" entered on its course with the year 1864, a nearly square two-column monthly of sixteen or twenty pages as the case might be—subsequently bi-monthly, and often of even more pages. Its name sufficiently declared its character. Its mottoes were the text, Jer. vi. 16: "*Fermatevi in su le vie*," etc., and the dictum of Tertulian: "*Id quod verius prius, id prius quod ab initio*." Its leading principle was thus announced in the second number: "*To examine the Church of Rome as it is now found, and to judge it by the threefold rule by which the Church herself claims that her practices and her doctrines have been and are determined: 1. Sound reason. 2. The Word of God revealed in the Holy Scriptures. 3. The teachings of the Apostles, universally received and followed by the primitive Church.*"

On this basis the "*Esaminatore*" made its way slowly and steadily to a recognized position. It was circulated experimentally wherever lists of probably well-affected priests could be obtained; it was sent to members of Parliament, to directors of the liberal press, to schoolmasters and teachers, and to other educated and supposedly liberal persons. It was offered freely to any who desired to receive it, and who were unable to pay for it. It was, of course, very often instantly sent back with objurgations or expressions of contempt and indignation. It was more commonly utterly ignored. It was sometimes received for a while in silence, and then acknowledged by a cautious note or letter expressive of curiosity, of interest, of a desire for further information, of gratitude. Many were the requests for the proffered continuance of the paper gratis; sometimes an inclosure of the price of subscription (10 *lire* or \$2 per annum); occasionally a contribution of an article for publication.

The earliest writers for the "*Esaminatore*" were naturally

found among those who had already given public expression to their reform principles. Some to whom it was sent experimentally soon became identified with its collaboration. Among these was one deserving of special mention alike for his position, his ability, and his character, Monsignore *Luigi Tosi*, Canon of the Cathedral of Cremona, and for four years—from 1868 to 1872—Capitular Vicar, that is, ecclesiastical administrator, of that vacant See. Some of these writers were members of the Cathedral Chapter of Milan, and formerly identified with the *Società Ecclesiastica* already cited. A priest of Udine found a copy of the “*Esaminatore*” in one of the *calle* of Venice, looked it over, read it, was astonished to find there views and convictions which he thought peculiar to himself; and, coming soon afterwards to Florence, he sought out Bianciardi, and became one of the most earnest factors and ablest contributors to the paper.

The immediate Tuscan advisers of Bianciardi were Prevosto *Barzacchini*, an old personal friend and the estimable, learned, though retiring priest of a neighboring country parish; Commendatore *Brunone Bianchi*, Prior of St. Lorenzo in Florence, and the Canon Reali, of Siena. The director looked also for valued counsel to Mons. Tosi, Mons. Tiboni, Prevosto *Natale Pavesi*, a wise Milan rector, and to other of his Milan co-laborers. These, with his colleague from Udine, with Mongini, Sciotto-Pintor, and Count Tasca, and with still others who wrote under pseudonyms, formed an able staff, to say nothing of his own name and labors, and, later, of the occasional correspondence of Cardinal D’Andrea, and of a few eminent civilians.

The “*Esaminatore*” thus brought those who held reform principles both to clearer and riper views, and to the knowledge of each other, in an interchange of thought, aspiration and argument; and, at the same time, it bore public witness to the fact that there existed within the Italian church a body of sincerely devout ecclesiastics and laymen, who, precisely because they were staunch Catholics, were resolved to examine thoroughly into the relations which the papal system bore to the true interests of the Church and of Italy.

By June, 1865, they were ready to set forth a programme to this effect:—

“Our fundamental idea is the restitution of their ancient Catholic rights and duties to all orders of the faithful, whether ecclesiastics or laymen. Therefore:—

“1. The laity to elect their parish priests and to administer the temporal affairs of the Church.



"2. The clergy and the laity to elect their bishops, saving the rights of the Crown.

"3. The bishops and metropolitans to have restored to them their old Diocesan and Provincial rights, their present servile dependence on the Pope and all oaths of vassalage to Rome being abolished.

"4. The clergy to be free to marry or to live in celibacy.

"5. The Holy Scriptures to be freely circulated among the laity.

"6. The Church services to be in the national tongue understood by the people.

"7. Confession to be no longer obligatory, but voluntary. The communion in both kinds."

That Baron Ricasoli should from the first be a cordial and a firm supporter of the "*Esaminatore*" was a matter of course. When he learned to what extent its origin had been due and its support secured by foreign interest, he was startled and no little disturbed; but, as he came afterwards to realize with what loyalty that assistance had been and was ever rendered, he thoroughly appreciated it, while, at the same time, he entered warmly into the desire and aim of the director to place their paper as soon as possible on a footing of self-supporting independence. Other eminent laymen and secular publicists became, one by one, interested in and even more or less identified with the "*Esaminatore*," — notably, in 1867, Count Mamiani, — among whom also may be named, at least as "*associates*" (that is, subscribers) and well wishers, so distinguished a patriot as Marquis Gino Capponi, the poet and novelist Alessandro Manzoni, and such eminent educators as Tommaseo and Lambruschini.

Thus, though due to English inception and, for some time, indebted also, in part, to foreign support, the "*Esaminatore*" was none the less, from the first, an organ, — not of foreign influence, — but of truly Italian Catholic interest and principles. The Rev. Mr. Hogg, leaving Italy in 1866, was replaced in his personal relations with Bianciardi by the present writer. But in no respect was the policy which had prompted the initiative of these relations changed. The loyalty of the Anglo-American Church to those relations and that of the "*Esaminatore*" to its principles was, in fact, soon put to a crucial test. The publication of a certain article, of which Bianciardi did not approve, was urged on him under circumstances which seemed to imply that the continuance of foreign help might be involved in his decision. He turned to the wisest of his ecclesiastical friends for counsel, especially to Prior Bianchi, Monsignore Tosi, and Canon Reali. They all and instantly replied that the

responsibility to God was their own; that no foreign friends could assume it; and that he ought to refuse, from whatever source, any assistance which could, even by implication, involve the least surrender of their independence in their sacred work. Such a reply gave, of course, the most undoubted guarantee of the single-minded devotion to ecclesiastical duty and to religious truth which governed those in whose hands rested the direction and guidance of the "Esaminatore," and placed the relations between them and those who represented Anglo-American sympathy, from that time forth, on a footing of the most unambiguous mutual respect and confidence.

During the year 1868 Parroco Mongini, who had from the first chafed at the calm conservatism and uncontroversial spirit which ever characterized the "Esaminatore," published in Turin a small sheet entitled "L' Unità Cristiana," designed to be more progressive, and to speak in a bolder tone; indeed, in name and style, as well as in purpose, to make a speciality of antagonizing the well-known Turin organ of the Jesuits, "L' Unità Cattolica." But the fiery Parroco was able to maintain it only for a single year.

The importance of the "Esaminatore," as an organ for the calmer Catholic reformers, was the greater from the fact that, during all these years, the secular press, certainly the more influential journals without exception, treated ecclesiastical and religious questions as beneath their notice, and refused to admit to their columns, even as paid advertisements, any contributions on such subjects. The "Diritto," for instance, gravely remonstrated with Count Mamiani, in 1867, for his public recognition of the "Esaminatore," as beneath the dignity of his character.

On similar grounds the leading booksellers would not keep on open sale books or pamphlets treating on religious or even on ecclesiastical reform. Professor Bianciardi and his colleagues found it, therefore, equally necessary to supplement the "Esaminatore" by setting up a little bookshop, or *Libreria Rosmini*, to make a speciality of such publications, as well as to furnish that journal an office of issue. The charge of this *Libreria* was given to a certain Don *Marco Petronio*, a worthy priest and liberal refugee from Istria.

For five years Professor Bianciardi thus continued to conduct the "Esaminatore," and to be the representative standard-bearer of these reformers, with equal ability, skill, wisdom, patience and devotion. His own contributions to its pages were of recognized

literary value, and that journal was sought and read, for their sake, by very many who cared nothing whatever for the cause in which it was published. The irreligious army officer, the openly skeptic naturalist and the bigoted papist alike would seek it in the cafés for its pure Tuscan, and for its fresh, kindly and sometimes quaintly humorous discussions of the more important issues of the day. Some of the director's contributions to its pages, such as the "*Veglie del Prior Luca*," and the Letters of "*Amico Frulla*," deserve a permanent place in the Italian literature of the period.

If now it be remembered who and what this Stanislao Bianciardi was,—a well-known man, certainly, in the literary and political circles of Tuscany,—and the ecclesiastical convictions he had put on record in the Introduction to his "*History of the Popes*," already quoted; if it be remembered what were the principles of the "*Esaminatore*," as declared at the start, and more explicitly set forth in 1865, and the nature of the questions which had been freely discussed in its pages for these five years; if it be remembered, on the other hand, that this paper had been denounced, and its reading positively prohibited, by the authorities of the Church, and the faithful warned by the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" not to permit it so much as to come into their houses,—if these things be remembered, the significance of the fact that it could exist in Italy at all will be appreciated; much more that such ecclesiastics as have been named should form its editorial staff, and that it should be publicly countenanced, as already noted, by some of the most eminent civilians of the time.

What inferences should be further drawn from these data of its circulation, gathered from some memoranda at the close of 1867?

One thousand copies had been published of each issue during that year, a smaller number than for previous experimental distribution; of which some 200 or 300 were still sent to persons of public position, members of Parliament, teachers, etc., as it was expressed, *per omaggio*. Of the rest, 314 were received and paid for, at ten *lire*, by priests of the Church; and 141 lay "*associates*" received it also as paying subscribers. It was also sent to 55 priests and 43 laymen who had asked for and received it gratuitously. Of these 369 priests who dared take such a paper at such a time,—nay, of the 314 who paid for it,—no less than 56 were of the Diocese of Cremona,—that of Mons. Tosi; 32 were Milanese, 23 Mantuans, 19 of Padua, 17 of Lodi, 14 of Brescia, 14 of Verona, 13 of Udine, and 9 of Pavia,—all Dioceses of

Lombardo-Venetia. In no Diocese of Central or Southern Italy did the priest-associates of the "Esaminatore" exceed 5 or 6.

The assurance of an Italian self-support was also, at last, fully secured. These 455 paying subscribers alone very nearly met the cost of printing; and not only had the director help from Baron Ricasoli, but even the Italian government found an excuse for assisting in enabling him to keep up the above gratuitous circulation. The *bonâ fide* Italian income of the "Esaminatore" for 1868 was, in all, 2,000 *lire* in excess of all the absolutely necessary expenses of publication, and thus assured the future.

From the issue, in June, 1868, of the papal bull, convoking an Ecumenical Council for December of the following year, it was manifest that the work was about to enter upon a period of new importance. From that time the coming Council was, of course, the leading subject of discussion; especially since, in Italy at all events, the hope was widely cherished, in spite of the foreshadowings of the "Civiltà Cattolica," that it might prove a *reforming* Council.

That fall Professor Bianciardi had a first opportunity of making a tour in North Italy, where — as clearly appears from the above data — the strength of the reform party lay, of meeting his Lombard colleagues in Milan, Cremona, Brescia, and elsewhere, and of concerting with them, as well as with his Tuscan advisers, the programme of the future of the "Esaminatore," and especially that for the coming year. In November this programme was published. A few lines from it are worthy of quotation: —

"The 'Esaminatore' has thus far chiefly aimed at the formation of public opinion, at the generation of those convictions which lead to great changes without shock or violence. This end has been attained. Yes; we say it confidently. The necessity of a reform in the Catholic Church is now very generally felt. Books and journals which, directly or indirectly, discuss or lead to it are read. Amid great ignorance and poverty of religious convictions in Italy, this chord alone, duly touched, responds. Those who, amid a universal indifference, give any attention to religion have formed some conception, however vague, of Catholic reform. Finally, those to whom the very word 'reform' lately brought terror or fear no longer avoid it, although many understand it most erroneously. . . . We repeat that it should be no other than a return to antiquity, according to the conception and the norm which results from a comparison of the Church of the earliest ages with that of the present time."

In these prolegomena the whole movement was advanced in definiteness of purpose. In December Bianciardi, now full of new spirit and sanguine energy, prepared for the printers the last number of the fifth volume, including in it a letter from Baron Ricasoli, heartily approving the new programme, and congratulating him upon the happy results of his patient labors; when he suddenly fell sick and *died* on the 22d of that month, without the power to give any directions or to make any provisions for the interests from which he was thus so abruptly taken.

No one of Bianciardi's more immediate counselors was at hand to supply his place, however transiently. Strange to say, his three Tuscan advisers were also all taken from the work almost in the same emergency. Barzacchini had died only the summer before; Bianchi and Reali both so quickly after him that the three-fold blow seemed but one. Even the writer — his foreign friend — was at the time absent in America. Proposals were at once pressed upon the family for the purchase of the "*Esaminatore*," as it proved, in the interests, on the one hand, of an irreligious hostility to the Church, and on the other, of an Ultramontane hostility to all reform. The "*Esaminatore*," with all the interests and the influence it held in trust, seemed now going adrift like a boat among the stormy waves of the open sea, with none to hold it to its course, when an American lady, who alone was at the time fully in a position at once to understand the interests at stake and to act promptly, took the responsibility which there was no one else to take, and secured the power to those who alone had a right and were competent to do it to decide upon the future. At the instance of this lady, and by her assistance, the last number of the paper for the year was published, on December 31st, exactly as already prepared by the late director, save only the announcement of his death and the assurance of an early resumption of publication. Early in the new year the first number of the sixth volume appeared, as thus promised, under a provisional direction, which was represented before the public by Sig. Carlo Bianciardi, guided by those in whom his father had confided, and in entire accordance with the plans and programme so lately announced by him.

Such were the trying conditions under which the "*Esaminatore*" and its staff of *collaboratori* — of which the Lombardo-Venetian writers were now the chief — entered upon the year 1869, that immediately preceding the Vatican Council. During this year, while the loss of Bianciardi's own writings cost it largely its mis-

cellaneous circulation, it yet held its ground as the organ of the Catholic reformers. Some of the ablest and most vigorous polemic language of the day was reëchoed from every part of Europe in its pages, and keenly applied to the ecclesiastical issues then pressing upon Italy. In its pages the liberal Italian Catholics heard every warning voice of power, which the approach of the Council called forth, whether Italian or from other lands. The *Libreria Rosmini*, at the same time, began a course of pamphlet republications of the most timely articles from the "Esaminatore," and translations from other languages, which were freely circulated, single pamphlets, or sets of such publications, being sent to all who asked for them, with or without pay. In these and other ways this little agency became the medium through which the liberal priests of Italy, however scattered or remote their residence, were kept informed by the best thinking of the liberal Catholics of the period.

From the date of the meeting of the Council a great change began to come over both the Italian secular press and the opinions of public men. The "Esaminatore" was itself, directly though informally, encouraged by the government, which was even glad to avail itself of the services of some of the best writers on its staff. A very able French politico-ecclesiastical discussion of *Le Concile Écumenique et les Droits d'États*, prepared by Mons. Tosi, though printed in Florence, was published in Paris, and was widely circulated beyond the Alps as well as throughout Italy; and a trenchant popular pamphlet on the "Pretended Personal Infallibility of the Pope," written by the Udinese priest already referred to, was published at official instance, and a large part of the edition bought up and distributed in the Council itself.

The columns of the secular press were first opened — by the "Nazione" of December 10, 1869, — not to Italian ecclesiastics, but to a foreign writer, in his character of a friendly student of current political ecclesiology; and, during the continuance of the Council, the representative of Anglo-American sympathy with Catholic reform interests was very frequently invited to contribute, over his own name, to this and several other journals. The ice once broken, however, other and of course principally Italian writers were now welcomed, though at first cautiously, until "L'Italie," a French Florentine paper of large circulation and great influence, went so far in June, 1870, as to devote a leader to the denial of the Papal Supremacy itself, sharply discussing, on patristic as well as on practical grounds, the claims of the See of Rome.



From this time great events followed, one hard after the other : the enforced definition of the dogma of Papal Infallibility ; the prorogation of the Council ; the Franco-German war ; the occupation of the city of Rome by the Italian troops. The seat of the papacy became the capital of Italy.

That which had been the question of the temporal power was, therefore, solved. The nation and the age now passed to the question of the spiritual supremacy, — the question, that is, of the conditions under which alone the Catholic Church could adjust herself to a united kingdom of Italy and to a constitutional monarchy at the Quirinal. "The Roman question," said the "*Nazione*," "we shall never sufficiently repeat it, rises before us entire and intact, and more urgent than ever, the day we enter Rome." "The temporal power having fallen," said "*L'Italie*," "the Church herself will undergo insensibly a transformation, and will end, it is to be hoped, by identifying herself with progress and with human society."

Interest in these questions and in the subject of the catholic reform of the Church was, then, from this time forth, no longer confined to a comparatively small circle of ecclesiastics, nor was it, thenceforth, thought strange if the secular press and public men took active part in such discussions.

The work of the "*Esaminatore*" was done. There was no longer need of a special organ for the examination of such questions, nor of a special *Libreria* to put on sale and distribute a class of publications which could now be found in almost any leading bookshop of Italy. Parties and schools of thought exist, as such, for the maintenance and advocacy of *distinctive* principles. They cease to exist not only when their principles are discredited, but also when they cease to be distinctive. Such was the case when, at the end of 1870, the *Libreria Rosmini* was closed, and the "*Esaminatore*" was, by common consent of its surviving counselors, transferred to the hands of Professor Cassani, of Bologna, by whom it was thereafter issued as the "*Rinnovamento Cattolico*."

The real successors of the "*Esaminatore*" were, however, the more influential of the secular journals of Italy, and those who yet remained of the early ecclesiastical staff of the organ of the Catholic reformers now found themselves engaged with the most eminent secular publicists of the day in the study and the discussion of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope and other cognate questions. Notably was this the case after the government had (December 9, 1870) laid before Parliament the project of the Law of

the Papal Guarantees, which gave the subject of Church reform, in its social and political bearings at all events, a place among those which were on all sides recognized as the great issues upon which would largely depend the future of Italy.

Other causes also contributed to raise the interests, heretofore discussed within an arena so limited, up to a higher as well as a far more extended plane. The stand taken by Dr. von Döllinger and his Munich associates, the resolute refusal of the Old Catholics of Germany to submit to the Vatican decrees, the pleadings of the dying Montalembert, and the bold ringing words of the Père Hyacinthe, all combined to make those who sympathized with them, whether on political or on religious grounds, participants in a controversy which was now international in its scope and character.

But Italian statesmen and Italian churchmen had to deal with it under circumstances far other than those under which the German Old Catholics were placed. For, *first*, the question was, in Italy, as truly one of national statesmanship as of religious import, the two interests being inseparable; and, *secondly*, it was one which had to do — not, as in Germany, with a foreign papacy which could be simply renounced — but with a system which was rooted at the very centre of its own religious and ecclesiastical life; which could not be abruptly torn out without uprooting with it the Christianity of Italy; and which must, therefore, be not only recognized, but accepted *de facto*, until it could be gradually replaced by other and better institutions growing up in its stead.

From the time to which reference has been already made, when Baron Ricasoli declared it to be the policy of his government to give to the church of Italy "the power and the incentive to reform herself," he had consistently resisted all suggestion of applying an official pressure to hasten such a result. He believed that any reform so brought about or prematurely forced would not only be factitious and unreal, but be surely followed by violent reaction. "The reformation," wrote he to Bianciardi in 1868, "will triumph on the day when the conviction of its necessity shall have become the sentiment of the majority. It is in that way that great revolutions are accomplished in the times in which we live. . . . To sustain it with all one's strength and with firmness is a work of duty which, at such a time, leaves in the hands of God both the issue and the reward." And, in 1871, he said to the present writer: "The day of faith will come again, in time. I am myself too old to hope to see it save with the eye of faith. By

faith I see it, feel it, thank God for it, and rejoice over it: yet I do not forget what a work of training and educating must first be accomplished."

While, therefore, refusing, as minister, to apply a secular impulse to this reform which he so longed for, none the less, as an Italian patriot and as a Christian man, he omitted nothing within his personal power which could contribute either to remove obstacles to reform, to encourage the better class of priests, to assuage the bitterness of ecclesiastical polemics, or to educate the Italian conscience. He hailed with grateful joy the Whitsuntide Declaration of von Döllinger and his friends, himself furnishing to the "*Nazione*," for publication, a translation of that document; and, in the affectionate courtesy with which he ever met the representative of Anglo-American interest in Italian Catholic reform, he illustrated the breadth of his own Catholic convictions and sympathies. During the Parliamentary discussion of the Law of the Papal Guarantees, he was the real leader of a large minority who endeavored, in vain, to secure the adoption of a clause putting the property of the Church, of the control and custody of which the government was about to divest itself, into the hands of the local Church laity, instead of permitting it to pass by default into those of the hierarchy. The rejection of this Peruzzi-Ricasoli amendment was the fatal mistake of Italian public policy at this time, the reforming priests being thus delivered up to the absolutely despotic control of an episcopate, itself in utter vassalage to the papacy.

The transference of the seat of government to Rome in 1871 was followed, not long thereafter, by a transference of the government itself to the Left or Radical party. This worked, so far as government influence went, a formal and largely an actual suspension of further interest in ecclesiastical affairs, as though they had been really established on a permanent footing by the law just referred to. One by one, also, those who had been the leaders in the ecclesiastical discussions of late years passed away, — Mons. Tosi died early in 1872, Mons. Tiboni, Prevosto Pavesi, Count Tasca, and others during the two following years: and the American Episcopal Church relinquishing, about the same time, its active relations with the field, lost the power of knowing how far these were succeeded by other and younger men.

Baron Ricasoli himself lived till 1880, Count Mamiani till 1885. Certain of the Italian nobility who had been deeply interested in this subject, certain members of the Senate and of Parliament, yet

maintain their interest. Not a few of the younger clerical associates of the "Esaminatore" and the faithful sons of faithful lay reformers of the period now past, still hold this hope dear. But looking back upon the Catholic reform movement of 1861-75, they and we can now see that the specially educatory and preparatory work of that period was brought to an end by the Law of the Papal Guarantees, the transference of political power to the Radicals, and the death of the earlier leaders of that movement.

Were its long, faithful, and self-devoted labors then in vain? Have its hopes perished? Far, very far, from it! Who shall presume to interpret, while they are but partly unfolded, the ways and purposes of Providence? The great political revolution itself was borne on by two generations of patriots, in distinct stages separated by periods of apparent arrest and inaction — during which the outside world ever declared that it had failed — to its consummation in 1870 and 1871. Much more is it only reasonable to believe that out of the learning and labors, the hope and the faith of the generation which has done its work and entered into rest, will yet arise those who are to reap what they have sowed, — to take up this Catholic reform, and, in God's own good time, to go on with it to God's own end.

Who shall even now say that the Church has heard the last words of Padre Curci, or what is to be the result of those which he has already so faithfully and so bravely spoken? Who shall say whereunto the faithful witness, in Rome itself, of Savarese and Campello will yet grow?

In the language of Baron Ricasoli — the statesman who was as unfaltering in his religious trust as inflexible in his political integrity: "There is no affection which requires such freedom in the forms of its manifestation as the religious sentiment. Christianity has not yet attained its full triumph. . . . It is now necessary to turn once more to the fountains; it is necessary to draw from the very words of Christ the reanimating spirit of the religious affection, the true salvation of the individual, and the safety of human society. The reforming movement advances slowly in Italy, but yet it advances. . . . The most important step has been taken, and it will never be retraced. The temporal power at an end, the Christian regeneration of the peoples has become inevitable. Let us take courage, then; and let us labor on as best we may in this great work."

*Wm. Chauncy Langdon.*

BEDFORD, PA.

## EDITORIAL.

## IS THE ORTHODOX PULPIT ORTHODOX?

WE use the term orthodox — for which we have no special predilection — as a convenient designation which distinguishes the great so-called evangelical bodies from Unitarians and Universalists. Our question is the practical one whether or not the doctrines which are supposed to be held by the evangelical churches are preached with substantial integrity in the pulpits of those churches. This question, which is frequently asked, has been recently reopened by an article of Edward Everett Hale's, entitled "Why am I a Unitarian?" which appeared in the March number of the "North American Review." Among his reasons he presents as one of the most cogent the freedom of Unitarian clergymen from allegiance to a theological creed. He affirms that the preaching of orthodox churches is at a wide remove from the doctrines of the accepted creeds, and that this inconsistency induces trifling with convictions, casuistry, downright dishonesty on the part of the clergy, disrespect, doubt, skepticism on the part of the laity. The same allegations were even more definitely urged some years ago in an article on "Sincerity in the Pulpit," by the same writer, and in the same periodical.

We do not propose to discuss the advantages which Mr. Hale claims for the simple belief of Unitarians (which he sums up as faith in the heavenly Father, hope in an immortal life, and love for all the children of God), but only to inquire concerning the truthfulness of his charge of insincerity and inconsistency on the part of the body of preachers in the evangelical churches. Is it true that the staple of preaching is faith, hope, and love, as he explains them, while the peculiar doctrines of the historic creeds are ignored, so that after all there is no very great difference between orthodox and Unitarian sermons? Is it true that if a Unitarian drops into a Congregational church he will hear about such a sermon as he hears at home, and if a Methodist, in a strange city, happens into a Unitarian church he will suppose that he is listening to one of the intelligent presiding elders of his own communion? Among the doctrines specified in Mr. Hale's article are the divinity of Christ, the total depravity of mankind, and the everlasting punishment of the wicked. We suppose he would also include the atonement and supernatural regeneration. We have before us, then, a question of fact, or rather two questions. We are to decide, if we can, what the average preaching really is, and also what the best, the most intelligent preaching is becoming. Are these doctrines preached for substance in the great majority of evangelical pulpits, and further, even if they are, does not the preaching of the more thoughtful and advanced clergymen ignore them, and may we not, therefore, infer a tendency which indicates what the average pulpit of the near future is likely to be?

One of the facts on which Mr. Hale relies is not available for his purpose, and should be set aside at the outset of our inquiry. It is the fact that there are frequently received into the membership of Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational churches persons who do not assent to all the doctrines contained in the creeds of those churches. But it is quite generally understood that complete assent to a creed is not to be required for admission to the church. A creed stands as a statement, substantially faithful, of the beliefs of the majority of the church, but no church is warranted in excluding a sincere follower of Christ because he cannot subscribe to every doctrine of the creed. With entire consistency churches receive into membership those who discard particular doctrines, reserving the right of judging how wide a departure from the common belief may wisely be allowed. A church is unfaithful to its trust if it tests fitness for membership by exactness of theological opinion. When young ladies of sincere Christian purpose are refused admission to a church because they do not accept the doctrine of endless punishment (as we are informed was recently the case in this vicinity), there must have been either intolerance or a grave misunderstanding of the uses of a creed.

The first question, then, concerning the orthodox pulpit is in respect to the actual facts. Is the preaching orthodox or is it not? Very few are qualified to judge from the sermons to which they themselves listen, for scarcely any one hears a sufficient number of preachers to warrant him in generalizing broadly. But there are certain facts which may be taken as trustworthy indications.

For example, the sermons preached by bishops of the Methodist Church at annual conferences of clergymen and lay delegates have a representative character. The bishops have exceptional means of knowing the theological temper of the great denomination over which they preside. We have frequently read reports and heard accounts of those sermons preached on the closing Sunday of conference to immense congregations, and we are certain that the warp and woof of such discourses is some of the very doctrines which have been mentioned. The divinity of Christ, redemption through his blood, instantaneous regeneration, and the everlasting consequences of the present life are favorite subjects, and not, except as results, childlike faith in God the Father, hope of immortal blessedness, and love to mankind. At camp-meetings, also, the same themes are uppermost; but we do not make as broad an inference, because, although many clergymen are present, the immediate object is to gain converts rather than to edify the clergy and the church. And yet the truths and motives which are employed to make converts represent a preacher's thought of that which is the essential character of the gospel. We do not believe that the average Unitarian would find himself in sympathy with the sermons and hymns of a Methodist camp-meeting.

Another indication may be found in the discourses of popular evangelists. It is unquestionable that multitudes of people are impressed, at least for the time, by the arguments and appeals of Moody and his



fellow-workers. These men not only have definite opinions as to the teaching of the Bible, but also have unusual opportunities of learning to what sentiments average congregations respond. We have been associated with Mr. Moody in a series of meetings extending over six weeks, and have listened to other revivalists (not always with entire satisfaction), and we know what they preach about. The divinity of Christ is held in the most extreme form. Jesus is God. He is present with all divine power. He is everywhere. He knows every thought and feeling. He is able to save "just now." He is an "Almighty Saviour." Men should come to Him, should commit their lives and destinies to Him. Faith in Christ is much more frequently urged than faith in the Heavenly Father. The atonement is presented in the most literal form. The blood, the death, the cross of Christ are the means of salvation. Scarcely any attempt is made to show the spiritual significance of these figurative terms. Jesus suffered in place of the sinner. Jesus paid it all. He made an objective atonement which propitiated God so that He forgives those who repent. Sometimes it is explained that the atonement originated in the love of God, but even then it is assumed that the atonement is a literal propitiation for sin. The doctrine of everlasting punishment is proclaimed without qualification. The people have no doubt that, in the opinion of the revivalist, if they, without having repented, should die to-morrow, they would find themselves in hell. And the object of preaching is instantaneous conversion. Amendment of life is merely an evidence of the supernatural change which has occurred, but it has little or nothing to do with one's salvation. There are, indeed, many people in our evangelical churches who do not wholly approve the preaching nor the methods of revivalists, but there are very many who do approve most heartily, and clergymen, with few exceptions, coöperate with every earnest evangelist. The favorite hymns are in keeping with the sermons. The theology, which is clothed in easy rhyme, and sung to jingling tunes, is of the most uncompromising character.

Still another indication is found in efforts made for the salvation of pagan nations and savage tribes. Foreign missions lie very near the hearts of devoted Christians. What gospel, now, do the churches send to the heathen? Undoubtedly the gospel of salvation through the atoning sacrifice of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is both God and man. Education is provided, — schools are founded as well as churches. But many of the supporters of missions look with some jealousy on schools and colleges, lest preaching of the simple gospel of salvation should be neglected. Heated discussions concerning a future probation for heathen show this, at least, that both advocates and opponents of the supposition believe that salvation is possible only through some kind of faith in a divine Saviour. It is assumed that there is only one gospel for men; that Christianity is different in kind from all other religions, and is destined to supersede them because Jesus Christ is truly divine.

The very criticisms which are passed upon sermons show where the

emphasis is placed. It is said that preaching is not practical enough; that it does not help in daily life; that it is too speculative or abstract. Such criticism usually has in view the prominence given to doctrine over conduct.

It is very frequently announced that a series of sermons is to be preached by this or that minister on the doctrines of the creed.

Mr. Hale himself furnishes an illustration somewhat inconsistent with his own statements. He tells of a minister who wished to come over to the Unitarians:—

“He had given me a sketch of his last Sunday’s sermon. Nothing more broad was ever preached by Martineau, or Bellows, or Savage. He had preached it to six hundred people in an Evangelical Orthodox church in Connecticut, and they seemed well pleased. I said at once, ‘Why come to us? Stay with this people. We do not care a fig what they call themselves.’ . . . The poor man looked puzzled for an instant, and then said: ‘Oh, you do not understand at all. Why! I shall have to pay for that sermon now all through four or five Sundays. For so long a time as that, at least, I must preach about Noah’s Ark, or Solomon’s Temple, or the fall of man, or the decrees, or some other bit of those things. It is not more than once in six weeks that I have the privilege of such audacious freedom as I enjoyed last Sunday.’”

It is not explained why the people should have liked the broad sermon so well, and yet have demanded, as a kind of atonement, sermons of quite another type. Nor do we believe that the congregation is to be found which would tolerate sermons on Noah’s ark, Solomon’s temple, or the fall of man. The minister must have been woefully stupid as to the real wishes of his people. But if the illustration means anything, it means that the man knew his congregation expected preaching on the distinctive doctrines of orthodox belief.

We have not, up to this point, attempted anything more than to learn the facts. We have expressed neither approval nor disapproval of the preaching of Methodist bishops, itinerant evangelists, foreign missionaries, and the majority of clergymen. We have pointed to certain indications which seem to us unmistakable that the vast majority of the preachers of the great religious bodies hold the important articles of the creeds with entire sincerity, and preach them with earnest conviction.

But is there not a marked tendency, which is likely to become general, to soften the asperity of traditional beliefs, and do not the intelligent preachers lay more emphasis on conduct than on opinion? Are not our prominent city pulpits nearly silent concerning the doctrines of the creed? Is it not, therefore, legitimate to conclude that the change will become general? Is it not safe to predict that within a short time nearly all preachers will confine (or broaden) themselves to proclaiming faith, hope, and love?

There is not the slightest question that important changes have occurred in the manner of presenting religious truth. The modern sermon is quite different from the mediæval sermon, and from the sermon to

which our grandfathers and fathers listened. Some of these changes are noticeable in almost all pulpits; others which are in progress are doubtless symptomatic. But it cannot be taken for granted that a new set of opinions has replaced the old, and that the material of preaching has essentially changed. Changes in form are easily mistaken for changes in substance. We at least have to inquire whether the advance which has really been made is other than an improvement in respect of reality, adaptedness, directness, — that is, improvement in the mode of presenting of beliefs which have long been held.

An important difference between the doctrinal preaching of the past and of to-day is that formerly the principal object was to show that a doctrine is true and Biblical, while now the object is to bring the doctrine into actual contact with motive and life. The doctrinal sermon addressed to our grandfathers urged reasons in defense of a doctrine, answered objections to it, annihilated opponents, adduced copious Scriptural quotations, and then, the strength of the preacher and the listeners having been expended, tacked on a brief "improvement." The discourse had in view an opponent, and was, directly or indirectly, controversial. All this, happily, is passing away. If there is doctrinal preaching now, it is of a different type. If such sermons are preached, they are felt to be crude and barren. To-day the preaching which is influential seeks to make real the correspondence of truth with life. The attempt is made not only to vindicate the doctrines of the gospel to reason by a logical process, but also to stir conviction, aspiration, and affection by interpreting God's truth to the heart of men. The use of doctrines is not merely to regulate opinion, but also to furnish motive to conduct. Doctrines are expressions of various phases of the divine character and purpose. They are elucidated in order to send the truth surging in beyond belief which apprehends it, to faith, and obedience, and love, which assimilate it. The preacher sees that truth is revealed, not so much to be gazed on, even with wonder and awe, but chiefly to be converted into the living product of holy character. Some one has classified preachers into two groups, — those who start with some thought concerning God and come down to man, and those who start with some need of man and rise up to the love of God. But in either case there is true doctrinal preaching, for revealed truth and actual life are brought together. Thus, faith in the Heavenly Father, hope of immortal life, love to the children of God, are among the principal results of the gospel in human life, but the question is, under what motives, under the influence of what truths or doctrines, these results are to be gained. These have to do with life, or rather, they are the life of the soul. But what truth or doctrine do they translate into action? Back of them lie doctrines concerning God the Father, the life immortal, the natural and the transformed state of man. That is the most profound doctrinal preaching which so presents the truths of revelation that the conclusions of reason and the aspirations of the heart press on eagerly, irresistibly, to these living results. Even the Unitarian

preaches a doctrine concerning God and man out of which faith, hope, and love shall grow; otherwise there is result without cause, conduct without motive. The method and the flavor of preaching is improving, but we are confident that the essential doctrines which have been held from the first are still the conspicuous themes of evangelical pulpits. There is more humaneness, more warmth and glow, more ethical wholesomeness, more delicate suggestiveness, more literary excellence. Truth is clothed in flesh and blood, while the old so-called bodies of divinity were often little more than gaunt skeletons. Yet these changes may signify, after all, only that there is more reality than with former generations in the apprehension and presentation of the truth as it is in Jesus.

Definitely: the development of Christian doctrine in the pulpit, and in religious literature, is towards the exaltation of Christ as supreme. He is the head of humanity, not merely its best teacher. He brings salvation from sin to every soul that will receive him. Through him, and through him alone, can man be at peace with God. His humanity has been restored to Christian apprehension, but the humanity is seen to have universality and absoluteness, so that He differs from all other men in his very power to make, as Napoleon said, of every soul an appendage of his own. He is the centre of the moral universe, the centre of attraction for all souls. The limitations to which his humanity subjected him are recognized; but, as the glorified Christ, he is delocalized, unlimited, is with his church alway unto the end of the world. The pulpit habitually preaches and assumes that Jesus Christ is one to whom the supreme allegiance of every man is due.

Again: the sacrifice of Christ through his sufferings and death is continually proclaimed as the ground and condition of peace with God through the forgiveness of sins. The attempt is not often made to present a satisfactory philosophy of atonement, but as fact and as motive it occupies a large place in the themes of the pulpit.

Still further: recent discussions have brought out important facts concerning the belief and the preaching which prevail. Heated debate has sprung up concerning the possible modes of salvation through Christ. It is agreed that all men who are saved from sin and death are saved through the sacrifice of Christ, and discussion is centred on the inquiry whether actual knowledge of Christ is necessary to salvation, or, without such knowledge, the benefits of his atonement may yet be enjoyed. Nothing is more conclusive as to prevalent beliefs than assumptions which are held in common by opponents. Thus, also, controversy concerning the possibility of future probation for those who have not had the gospel throws out in bold relief the principles which are agreed upon. The agreement on all sides, that for those who in this life have the gospel but reject it there is no ground for hope, is proof conclusive that faith in Christ as a divine Saviour is held to be indispensable to salvation. And the hypothesis of a future probation is based on the assumption that unless some time Christ is made known there can be no salvation from sin

and death. It is also undeniable that the belief prevails that those who reject Christ will be hopelessly condemned. If this possibility is not explicitly and frequently declared it is the background on which earnest appeals to accept Christ become vivid, and it is the alternative which is tacitly recognized by both preacher and hearer. At almost every service of the churches it is either taught or implied that Christ is the arbiter of the soul's destiny; and this means that He is divine, that He is the Saviour of men, and that He is to be the judge of the world.

The movement towards church unity is significant for our inquiry, On what basis is it proposed to effect a union? Certainly not on the basis of faith, hope, and love; for these, while they may mean nearly all that is distinctive of Christianity, may also mean little more than a bald Deism, which rests on natural religion; just as the term "religion" is so general that it includes Christianity and fetichism. A union of the gospel and of ancestor worship would not be very impressive, and yet they are two kinds of religion; they have something in common. Church union is considered by many in different communions to be practicable only on the basis of some one of the ancient creeds, and these creeds are chiefly occupied with the historic facts of Christ's Person and work in their supernatural character. Whether or not external union can be attained, or is even to be desired, it is very evident from the discussions of it that the ancient and fundamental doctrines are held in affectionate regard by the leaders of Christian thought in the great communions. Dr. Munger is a representative of advanced thought, and at his recent appearance before an ecclesiastical council in New Haven he said that the Nicene Creed is the most satisfactory expression of his actual belief.

We might dwell on the revival of Biblical preaching, to show that it is really a revival, in the best form, of the ancient doctrines as the prominent themes of the pulpit, but we content ourselves with citing only one more indication of the practical agreement of our preachers and churches with their creeds. That indication is found in the development of hymnology. The hymns which are most in favor with cultivated and intelligent Christians, and which are in marked contrast with the jingles and refrains already mentioned, are unequivocal in their exaltation of Christ, and in devout ascriptions of praise for his redeeming work. The doctrines of the divinity of Christ and his atonement are inwrought with fervid, reverent diction into such evening hymns as "Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear," and "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide;" such passion hymns as "O Sacred Head now wounded," "There is a green hill far away," "Rock of Ages, cleft for me;" such hymns of adoration as "Look, ye saints, the sight is glorious," "The head that once was crowned with thorns," "All hail the power of Jesus' name," "O very God of very God;" such a Trinity hymn as "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," such church hymns as "The church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord," and "Onward Christian soldiers," and the many hymns of heaven in rest and joy with Christ.

The growing regard for a liturgy with its collects and creeds could hardly coexist with the decline of that theology with which they are saturated.

The considerations we have offered are to us a decisive answer to the questions proposed. That there are some exceptions to the general practice is not denied. Sermons are preached which have very little gospel either on the side of motive or of result. Science, politics, current events occupy so large a place in some pulpits that hearers are sent hungry away. And yet we are convinced, for reasons such as have been offered, that there is practical fidelity in the vast majority of pulpits to the doctrines enunciated in the creeds, and that there are relatively few preachers who are in distress on account of the "cramp" or restriction of their creeds. (The doctrine of total depravity is not a church doctrine. What is believed and preached is not that all men are as bad as they can be, but that all men are sinners and in need of redemption.) So long as the doctrines of universal sinfulness, of redemption and eternal life only through Jesus Christ the Saviour, who was true God and true man, and the doctrine of eternal condemnation to those who do not believe on Christ, — so long as these doctrines are faithfully and generally preached we must conclude that the pulpit which is orthodox in name is in the best sense orthodox in fact.

We do, indeed, wish that breadth might take the place of much existing narrowness, that the Biblical diction and flavor might take the place of arid philosophizings, that more humaneness and reality might take the place of severity and vagueness. But so much progress has been made in that direction that we have no doubt the pulpit will continue to advance in a better understanding and use of its glorious gospel.

Departure from this or that creed is for the most part from the excrescences of false philosophy and false ethics which have been fastened on venerable beliefs. We reject unwarranted statements concerning accountability, freedom, the divine sovereignty, decrees, and the like, while we retain with the clearer conviction the great doctrines of revelation, which in substance are that "God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."

We fervently hope and confidently believe that the enlarging enlightenment and the deepening experience of believers will bring out more and more distinctly the truths once delivered to the saints, and will strengthen rather than weaken the belief that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.



## THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE LIBERAL OPPOSITION TO HOME RULE.

THE attacks made by leading Liberal statesmen in the House of Commons upon Mr. Gladstone's Bill providing for the establishment of an Irish Parliament undoubtedly indicate the attitude of a large section of the Liberal party towards the measure. The opposition of Lord Hartington alone would count for much, and when the waning but still potent name of Mr. Chamberlain, and those of Mr. Goschen and Mr. Trevelyan are added to his the prospects of the Bill's passing the House seem very doubtful. If it should pass it would certainly be thrown out by the House of Lords, in which case the Premier would appeal to the country; if, on the other hand, it should fail in the Commons, and the government go out of office, the Conservatives would be too weak in the present House to retain power; so that the question of Home Rule must in any case soon come before the electors. Any attempt to forecast their decision respecting it would, of course, be premature. One thing can be said with confidence, that the division which parts the leaders of the Liberal party represents a cleft in the party itself. Besides the defection of the statesmen named, the energetic opposition of leading Liberal newspapers (notably the "Daily News" and the "Spectator") shows that a considerable number of Mr. Gladstone's hitherto trusty followers are at present desirous of his defeat in the crowning struggle of his life.

There is nothing to excite surprise in this. Mr. Gladstone has more than once outstripped his party in his zeal to accomplish great reforms; and the change which he now urges is so great that it is not strange that the conservative instincts which are powerful in the Englishman, though he be a Liberal, should be aroused. Besides, the question cannot be viewed in the dry light of the understanding. The people for whom a great demand is made have been long and angrily struggling with England for the great political privilege now asked for them. To grant the boon will require a conquest of natural feeling like that involved in receding from a position taken in some dispute with a neighbor, which he has denounced with abusive language, and so acknowledging that the coarse words expressed, if too roughly, a proper resistance to injustice.

It is not to be wondered at that many, even of Liberal Englishmen, cannot bring themselves to take part in helping crown with success the exertions of the National League, and of the Parnellite party in the Commons. It would be easier to do this if the practical advantages thus to be gained were not so great and so obvious. To let the Irish have their way because this will give relief from all but unbearable difficulties in carrying on the government seems too much like being driven to be congenial to the English blood. It is precisely those qualities which have made England powerful which cause many of Mr. Gladstone's friends to leave him now.

Yet it can hardly be without serious misgivings that they abandon

their great leader. They can scarcely help asking themselves, one would say, whether they are not deserting the principles which they believe should rule in their country's political life. Should their revolt prove unsuccessful, should the measure which has driven them from their party prevail, will they not by and by see that, in introducing and strenuously advocating it, the great Liberal statesman was only true to himself and the cause which he had served so long, and that they were led by the combined influence of timidity and passion into a course antagonistic to their country's highest interests?

We believe that such a change of mind is likely to come with the retrospect of these exciting days; at any rate we feel confident that students of English politics not blinded by prejudice against popular government, who shall a generation hence review the present crisis, will say that Mr. Gladstone was right in insisting that Home Rule should form a part of the Liberal creed, and that the Liberals who turned against him for so insisting were wrong.

For what is Liberalism but the advocacy of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people?" Why has the Liberal party always been regarded as doing its most characteristic act in laboring for the extension of the suffrage, if not because it was seen to live by the belief that it is for a nation's good that its laws strike their roots deep into the people's life? It was a mere piece of demagogism for this party to give the suffrage to 3,500,000 of the poorer and less intelligent among English citizens, unless it believed that that government is most stable and prosperous which gives to every class of its citizens a share in its law-making power. This does not imply, of course, the belief that the suffrage should be given to all adult males any more than that it implies that it be given to women and children: social and civic reasons imply a limit in every case; that limit is not necessarily drawn at a point as low as that assigned it in our republic, but it must, if the creed of English Liberalism be defensible, be drawn so low as to make the state, from top to bottom, essentially self-governing. The ballot was given by the Liberal party to the humbler classes in order that the subject of the law might have the cordial disposition towards it which comes from participation in making it. He was to feel that because it embodied, not the will of some one governing him through accident of birth, but that of the people of which he is a part, — his own will, as far as the nature of the case will allow, it claimed his hearty assent. English Liberalism says this is what English citizenship should mean, cordial obedience to law which is attractive to the citizen because of its recognition of his sovereignty.

But here are 5,000,000 of people, by legal constitution citizens of England, to the great mass of whom citizenship must mean a very different thing, namely, subjection to an alien, and, in great measure for this reason, an odious will. The laws under which they live are made for them, not by them. True, they have the privilege of voting for members

of the legislature by which these laws are made, but they feel that the great majority of that legislature is so separated from them by lack of sympathy with their character and their needs, as well as by ignorance of their social conditions, that legislation made by it for Ireland is English legislation imposed upon Ireland. And the laws relating to Ireland are practically made by this body; since the Irish members have no more influence than that which belongs to their comparatively small vote. That consciousness of civic power, therefore, which should go with the suffrage, does not belong to the Irish voter. He does not feel that he is an English citizen, but that he is an Irishman under English rule. The law of the British Empire, to be sure, provides for his being an Englishman, but it cannot make him so; nor can he make himself so, if he would. He found himself, when he came to years of discretion, an Irishman, differing in race and in religion from his neighbors who dwell on the sister island; having local feelings which are a part of his being, as essential and well nigh as important as his family affections; inheriting, it must be added, with the rest of his natural outfit, bitter memories of English oppression. These things make it impossible that the privilege of voting for a member of the British Parliament should be in his life what it is in that of the Englishman. He feels that he is under a yoke imposed on him by an alien power. The feeling is increased in strength by the historic fact that Irish wishes and sentiments lost the power of expressing themselves in Irish legislation through unrighteous and immoral means employed by the English government. A wrong a hundred years old may have become so imbedded in a people's life that it cannot be removed; but if it still be resented as a wrong, this resentment must also be accounted an established fact, having its own claim to recognition. Because Irish sentiment, fostered by the memory of this and many other wrongs, finds no expression in legislation, and because Irish sentiment is of the very life of Irish manhood, Ireland, notwithstanding its representation in the British Parliament, lacks that great boon which the elective franchise confers on Englishmen.

This Mr. Gladstone has frankly owned in words which are among the noblest and most memorable ever spoken by English statesmen. He has drawn the inference that the discrimination between Englishman and Irishman, in the matter of representation, must be removed before England can expect the same loyalty to law from Irishmen which it receives from Englishmen. This is true Liberalism. Those who turn against their former leader for saying it, and for trying to make England say it both by word and deed, are Liberals no longer. The objections they make to Home Rule show that they do not shape their conception of what England owes to Ireland by their Liberal principles.

'We ought not to give the Irish a parliament of their own because they have been breaking the law, and to reward law-breakers is immoral. Then the people are largely Roman Catholic, and if they made their own laws might, under the influence of their priests, make laws discriminating

against their Protestant fellow-citizens. Besides, they are too ignorant and impulsive to be capable of self-government.'

What have we here but a frank avowal of determination to continue withholding self-government from Irishmen, — in other words, to hold Liberal principles only in regard to Englishmen. It is like the slaveholders' saying that they held to the sentiments of the Declaration of Independence if understood as applying to white men alone. For those who supported Mr. Gladstone last year in giving the ballot to a host of agricultural laborers cannot maintain that they are now opposing him merely because the Irish lack the qualifications needed for voting intelligently. And it has long been a principle of the Liberal party that religious opinion should not anywhere in Great Britain be held a disqualification for voting. The doctrine that a whole community ought to be disfranchised because some members of it have done lawless acts is surely anything but Liberalism. "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

No, when we find the "Spectator" urging upon such grounds as these that Home Rule ought not to take its place among Liberal measures, and discussing the question of Irish discontent and Irish claims without giving any weight whatever to the sense of civic impotence which is so galling to Ireland, we begin to understand the Irish hatred of English rule, whether Liberal or Conservative. The inconsistency of England in refusing the coveted boon has no doubt given the open wound its most rankling pains. It is harder to bear a wrong from a man who knows well what fair dealing is, and who has high moral impulses, than from one who has been trained under degrading influences. And it is obviously much harder for a people to suffer a great political deprivation from men who appreciate and extol the democratic principle than from an autocratic ruler, or a proud aristocracy. And in the case in hand the resentment is increased by the wronging party's insisting that the privilege desired is actually possessed. "You have the privilege of voting for members of the Imperial Parliament, and Ireland has more representatives in the House of Commons in proportion to her population than has England." And this from those who are insisting that Irishmen are too ignorant and passionate for self-government! The plea, assuming as it does that Irishmen ought to be so childishly satisfied with the form of civic power, though deprived of its substance, is admirably fitted to increase the resentment it is used to allay.

Nor is the reason most strenuously urged for withholding Home Rule, namely, that it would probably result in the total severance of the tie uniting Ireland to England, calculated to appease the Irish mind. For it seems ungenerous to refuse Ireland such power of political self-expression as England and Scotland have from apprehension that it will put this power to a certain harmful use.

The refusal implies a total distrust of any guarantees which the Irish may give through their leaders. It implies also that Irish hatred of

England will blind Irish eyes to the necessity of union to the welfare of both peoples. It is natural for Irishmen to say: "England can afford to give us the actual share in government which she has given to Scotland, whose representatives to all intents and purposes make their own laws, and abide the result. She is strong enough to conquer us if we try to break away from the empire. And her own professions of faith in popular government should lead her to believe that we shall remain in a connection which she regards necessary for our prosperity as well as for her own security."

Americans are asking themselves how soon the mass of English Liberals are likely to appreciate the righteousness of the Irish demand for Home Rule, and Mr. Gladstone's wisdom in seconding it, and favor granting the thing asked for in such form as the most mature judgment of English statesmanship shall approve. They know that when this happens the struggle is over, for they are sure that Liberalism has the future of English politics in its grasp. And they cannot but feel sure that they are not deluded by their hopes in thinking that prejudice will not much longer conquer principles hitherto firmly held and faithfully followed.

For the prejudice lives by hiding immense and obtrusive facts. Here is a country protesting most strenuously and persistently that its consent is not with a government which assumes as its own right to be the necessity of beneficent government expressing the will of the governed. The contradiction between the facts for which the government assumes to stand and the existing realities would be ludicrous were it not so painful. Mr. Freeman shows the incongruity in a sentence, when he says that "the attempt at an incorporation between Great Britain and Ireland has failed." The form of government existing presumes it to be successful, and becomes a dismal absurdity as soon as it is seen to be otherwise. But it has wretchedly failed. The institutions have ceased to express the political life of a great part of the nation. More than this: they have become so detached from its vital forces that they will not work. New ones it must have. And of what sort? Mr. Gladstone has answered the question, and it may be presumed that he has expressed the Liberal sentiment which is inchoate of English law.

#### THE CENTRALIZATION OF LABOR.

THE organization known as the Knights of Labor differs from the earlier labor organizations, like the trades' unions, by the fact that it seeks to utilize labor in the mass. The basis of power is practically shifted from skill to numbers. A "scab" is no longer an apprentice or an unskilled workman in the wrong place, but any workman, however skilled, who attempts to work outside the organization. The unifying principle is labor, not a trade; the workingman, not the craftsman, is the unit in the new combination. And the power in reserve is the power of numbers. A strike, to be effective, must be able to control not by

violence, but by actual possession, the labor market. A boycott must be able to command in its own right, rather than by the intimidation of the public, a sufficient number of consumers to ruin a business which has been put under the ban. While arbitration becomes the necessary and instant recourse, superseding the strike and the boycott only as capital finds itself confronted with a force which can act through responsible agents, and with the dignity and repose incident to numerical strength.

The conception of a vast organization representative of labor in the mass is certainly a grand conception, but it does not seem to have been apprehended as an idea so much as developed through a practical necessity. The French largeness of idea nowhere appears among American workingmen. There is no sentiment about the labor movement as it is here carried on. Labor is not transfigured and apostrophized. The situation sometimes becomes dramatic, as in the present contest between a great capitalist and the representative of a great labor organization, but the dramatic element is not cultivated. Work is still work, hard and grim in its features and commonplace in its reality. It has simply become more conscious, more calculating in respect to its resources, and more watchful of its opportunities.

The extension of organization, its use, that is, so far beyond the limits of the old trades' unions, is a natural counterpart to the growth and extension of capital. A capitalist is no longer a man in possession of thousands, but one in possession of millions. The most astonishing phenomenon of the past twenty years has been the accumulation of so many and so vast fortunes. Wealth exists in the hands of great numbers beyond any possibility of personal use. It surpasses even the capacity for luxury. It therefore seeks some kind of employment. A great deal of the capital of to-day is simply restless fortune in activity, rather than sober wealth under well-directed energy. Hence the number of unnecessary and illegitimate enterprises. Capital is equally busy in constructing and in "wrecking" railroads. But whether the business be legitimate or illegitimate, it is developed on a vast scale. A railway, for example, is no more a single line, but a "system." So Mr. Hoxie continually refers to the road under his management. And as capital has thus reached in its greater enterprises to the proportions of a "system," labor, naturally attempts a like process of extension and centralization. No one will dispute the right of this endeavor, and few will dispute the advantage to labor or capital of a wide-spread and responsible organization, if it can be maintained in its integrity, and can be made to coexist with the rights of free citizenship. Organized labor is the only power which can treat successfully with capital without recourse to the constant interference of the State. And we can well afford to bear with the mistakes and blunders of labor organizations until some satisfactory method of arbitration or adjustment can be established, if thereby the whole matter can be kept out of politics, — not out of legislation, but out of "practical" politics.



It is, however, a question whether labor is so far a natural unit as to allow any wide and permanent system of centralization. The Knights of Labor give a generous definition to labor. No distinction is made between work of the brain and of the hand. None are excluded from membership except capitalists and those who are supposed to be their advisers or agents. It is thought that the Order includes persons in scientific, literary, and professional life. Diversity of this kind may not be prejudicial to unity. The conflict will come, if at all, between skilled and unskilled manual labor. There is a natural aristocracy among workmen. The skilled workman, with high wages, constant employment, and a recognized social position, is not naturally sympathetic toward the unintelligent and restless laborer whose cause he may be called upon to champion. An apparent illustration of the tendency is to be seen in the attitude of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers toward the strikers on the Missouri Pacific Railway. So, too, account must be made of natural diversities of interest between the trades. Capital cannot be a unit because of diversity of interest, as witness the struggles in regard to tariff legislation. Why should labor hope to be able to reconcile differing and, at times, opposing occupations. Coöperation also, as involving the sharing of profits between the laborer and capitalist, may prove a disintegrating force. The workingman who has something at stake in a given business will naturally have a different idea as to its management from one who has nothing at stake beside his wages. And then we are to remember that capital, as well as competency, is the goal of American labor. Strictly speaking, we have no laboring class. The laborer of to-day is the capitalist of to-morrow, and the success of the one represents the ambition of the many. And, so far as our observation extends, the man who has risen from the ranks, and who takes most pride in the fact, is less sympathetic toward labor, and less conciliatory in his methods, than the man of inherited capital.

The immediate risk to the central labor organizations is in the want of competent local leaders. Under the rapid extension of membership, and the consequent lowering of the standard of skill and intelligence, everything depends upon the character of the men intrusted with authority. And in these circumstances leadership means above all things the power of restraint, caution, patience, in a word, conservatism. Power must be accumulated in large reserves before it can be wisely used, and when thus accumulated there will be little occasion for its use. This was the significance of the remark attributed to Master Workman Powderly, that there would be no more strikes. The growth of the Order under a rigid self-restraint would do away with the necessity of strikes. But the temptation to the premature and trivial use of newly acquired power is too great to be resisted by small men in local authority. And unless the central authorities are strong enough to control these men the Order is at once committed to blunders and defeats. Nothing is so hard, and yet nothing is so truly a sign of power, as the acknowledgment of a mistake,

the rectification of a blunder. We instinctively respect or fear the man who will not sacrifice success to pride or temper. In his first public appearances Mr. Powderly gave the promise of competent leadership. And we are not now disposed to deny to him the qualities of a great leader, in view of his surrender, against his judgment, to the leaders of the strike on the Missouri Pacific, for he may have seen that nothing else in the present case could save the Order in its integrity. But the surrender has certainly weakened his personal authority as well as that of the central organization, and a repetition would prove disastrous. It remains to be seen whether local leaders can be held under the severe restraints necessary to the maintenance of a vast centralizing organization.

A most serious danger from without threatens the great labor organizations if they persist in the use of exclusive and intolerant methods of maintaining their power. The American people will never tolerate any interference with the rights of private citizenship. Public sentiment will come in, and afterwards law if necessary, to protect the individual laborer against the tyranny of organizations, as surely as these will act in his behalf against the tyranny of corporations. The coercion of the individual will not be suffered after the evil becomes serious enough to attract general attention. A strike for a fair cause is justifiable and legitimate. A given body of men cannot be compelled to work except under their own conditions. Neither can the same body of men be compelled to buy against their choice. A boycott when confined to the withdrawal of patronage by any aggrieved party is perfectly legitimate. But when an organization goes beyond these limits and assumes the authority to prevent any individual from working or buying as he pleases, it invades the domain of personal rights. In the contest which is now going on over the country public opinion is holding a very delicate balance. The predominant sympathy is on the side of labor, but at the suggestion of unfairness or violence it passes instantly to the other side. And what public opinion says to-day in respect to individual rights the law will say to-morrow, if no statute exists which meets a given wrong.

But if labor in its present attempt to consolidate its power will avoid all unjust and intolerant methods, if it will seek to raise the standard of workmanship, as it is seeking to protect itself from the power of the dram shop, and if it will strive directly, rather than through the aid of politicians, for wise and helpful legislation, it will have the respect of all right-minded men in its endeavor, and will in the end secure results as favorable to capital as to its own interests.

## JOHN B. GOUGH: THE MASTER OF DRAMATIC ELOQUENCE.

WITH the great mass of English-speaking people in Great Britain and America, John B. Gough was undoubtedly the most popular and effective platform-speaker of his time. Everett and Phillips were earnestly admired by the cultivated audiences of America, but "the people" — who were never warmed by the polished brilliancy of Everett's beautiful speaking, and who were always waiting in vain to be thrilled under the reality and easy elegance that made up the magnetic charm of Phillips — yielded themselves willing captives to the vivid and vehement speech of the fiery Apostle of Moral Reform. Everett and Phillips counted their followers by thousands in their own land; Gough had his tens of thousands in both hemispheres, and they included miners and senators, shop-girls, merchant princes, working men and women, and peers of the realm. But comparisons are needless. There are degrees of power in all departments of human effort. There is a glory of art and a glory of nature. Each of these famous speakers achieved the highest excellence in his peculiar sphere.

What was the secret of Gough's remarkable power with the people? By the way of mere statement it is comparatively easy to refer it to an inborn, off-hand, impassioned eloquence, that was chiefly manifested through an extraordinary dramatic faculty, and directed by an intense moral earnestness to noble and philanthropic ends. But that is a description that does not describe. It is next to impossible adequately to convey the influence and the total impression of his power of speech to stir men's blood; it eludes analysis. There was but one way to appreciate his power, — to hear him.

The personal equation in the problem of Gough's oratorical career was of exceptional force. In any fair estimate of him it cannot be overlooked. A public speaker's art and influence, apart from the truths and facts of his theme, are but the reflection of his personality. The immense popularity that Gough enjoyed for more than twoscore years is sufficient evidence that he possessed original mental qualities of solid worth. In the philanthropic movements of his time he was distinctly a force, an influence, an able promulgator of real and vital truth; but it was the influence of a powerful advocate and not of a legislator. To adapt Johnson's remark concerning Burke, no man could meet him by accident under a gateway to avoid a shower without being convinced that he was a man of uncommon mind. But his mental temperament was neither philosophical nor logical; and yet he had the philosophy and the logic that are the constituents of robust, substantial good sense. He was a man of insight. His clear-headed judgments proceeded from the intuitional faculty and not the discursive. He was satisfied to represent what he clearly saw and to express what he really felt. Mere argument he cordially disliked, and was impatient of the fetters of system and for-

mule. When he did argue, his reasoning was luminous, rapid, and concentrated. If his strong feeling led him sometimes to speak extravagantly he rarely spoke at random. He made no pretension to "original thought," but he did his own thinking. His faculty was rather the ability so available to the public speaker, — that of assimilating and manipulating thought.

The source of his thinking was in his heart. There was in him a rare union of sense and sensibility. His temperament was preëminently sympathetic. He was made to love and to elicit love. To win a little child from its mother's arms delighted him more than to move an audience. Young men were the special objects of his affectionate solicitude. But the peculiarly fascinating characteristic of his noble sensibilities was their spontaneity. In the prodigality of his emotional life, expressing itself by the force of its own impulse, lay the deep spring of his artless and irresistible eloquence.

Of nearly equal power with his spontaneity of feeling was the influence of a vivid imagination. Its action was less upon the creative than the pictorial and representative side. He had a wonderful gift of realizing to his imagination an ideal presence. His emotions sensitively and powerfully responded to the ideal character, scene, or experience that he was delineating; for the moment his sensibilities were affected as if he were undergoing the experience with the exactness of reality. The audience caught the contagion and shared his emotional excitement with him. Add to this faculty of realizing an ideal presence his marvelous mimetic power, and you have the mental essentials of an actor. Infuse his mimetic gift with wit, humor, and pathos, and a deep, earnest feeling for the darker aspects of human experience, and you have the material for an accomplished actor in comedy or tragedy. Gough was a true man of humor, — of humor more than of wit, — and a true man of pathos. He was sometimes satirical, but his warm heart kept him from being cynical. Ridicule was a weapon often and efficiently used. With what touches of nature he made the whole world kin! With what realistic effect he painted the humorous, pathetic, and tragic aspects of human experience! How quickly did he move us from laughter to tears! Nor must his admirable gift of language pass unnoticed. He wrought no marvels with our English prose, but he had the power of communicating his rich and varied personality in clear, vivid, fluent, correct, and forcible diction. Without the gift of language he might have become, as at one time seemed likely, a consummate actor; with it, he became the world's illustrious exemplification of spontaneous Dramatic Eloquence.

The personal impression of this eloquent speaker is most difficult to reproduce in black and white. His lithe and well-knit figure, naturally slight and of medium height, had nothing remarkable about it in poise of attitude or grace of motion to attract attention. But to the last it indicated the possession of much physical and immense nervous energy.

There was a peculiar alertness in his gait and bearing that suggested any amount of stored-up electricity. The face gave the impression of nobility and force of character, and a gracious and winning friendliness of disposition; while his large, liquid blue eyes, with all their concentration of inward fire, beamed with an overflowing mirthfulness and good humor. His luxuriant hair, originally dark, in later years became a crown of silver-gray. Neither in the dress nor the deportment of this transparently honest man was there a trace of eccentricity. His voice by nature was a robust tenor of wonderful penetration, resonance, flexibility, and flute-like sweetness. In his younger years he was an admirable ventriloquist, and an accomplished singer of comic and sentimental songs. His voice was a noble organ of many keys, obediently sensitive to every touch of his varied feeling. His tones were especially susceptible to the expression of sympathy and pathos, but they were equally responsive to energy of feeling, and had a force and dash like the sound of a trumpet, fit to waken the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus. But years of incessant labor in vehement speech before great audiences, in efforts often sustained for over two hours, together with the animal heat of an audience mingled with the foul atmosphere of gas-infected and badly ventilated halls, gradually impaired his voice and seriously damaged the musical quality of its tone, turning it to huskiness, and inducing frequent hoarseness. The glorious instrument lost its purity, but kept its power. Notwithstanding its huskiness, it was distinctly audible throughout the largest assembly, by reason of the speaker's remarkably incisive yet easy enunciation. Nor did he, in his vocal decadence, fail to command his modulation; his voice was ever kept in tune from the fineness of his ear for music.

Any sober estimate of Gough's oratorical genius must be incomplete until it is referred to a moral more than to an æsthetic standard. Spontaneity of emotional temperament was reinforced by sincerity of moral purpose. The great motive power was an intense moral passion. The Divine call to him, which he recognized with a whole-hearted devotion, was to a direct moral and philanthropic apostleship. In temperance addresses and lyceum lectures he invariably aimed to touch hearts and affect lives. He earnestly desired to influence men on their best side, to raise their ideals of life, and to excite their aspiration to reach them. Few preachers have possessed his moral lifting-power. In the aims of his platform life, if not in the methods, he was the greatest lay-preacher of the age. Had he been a preacher and been true to the impulses of his nature he would have been a second Whitefield, and in many qualities would have surpassed the great Methodist. The resemblance between the oratorical genius and methods of these two great dramatic speakers is borne out in a remarkable number of particulars.

One element remains to be noted, — Gough's superabundant soul-power. The life of oratory, that which gives it the note of reality, that fuses together all the other elements, — the lightning that melts the mass,

and "moulds the souls of many into one," — what is it? It is an indescribable but very palpable *something*, scarcely known in its source, and seen only in its effects. We vaguely call it magnetism, electricity, sympathy. It is that which brings speaker and audience *en rapport*. Is it this? — on the spiritual side, moral earnestness; on the physical side, nerve-force? The union of the two is an electric eloquence. Nature endowed Gough with an inexhaustible supply of this magnetic nerve-force, and he gave it out with lavish expenditure. It was the fire that set his hearers aglow; but the very same fire gradually consumed the speaker himself.

This consideration brings us to a brief notice of this eloquent man's single-hearted care for his audience. Forty years of a life lived in the presence of public assemblies had thoroughly taught him the reciprocal relations of speaker and audience. He never forgot that there are two factors in the problem of public address, — the speaker and the audience. No speaker better understood the sympathetic influences that are constantly playing between speaker and audience, or more tactfully used his experience. An audience to him was not merely a collection of separate units; it was not a mosaic. It was an organism, palpitating with a common life and a common purpose. It was a colossal man with an individuality of its own that was to be convinced, moved, persuaded. Gough instinctively felt the character of that colossal individuality, and with unerring instinct he adapted himself to its varying moods. This oratorical tact, this aptitude for feeling an audience, accounts in part for his marvelous variety in treating his few topics. The same lecture was never given twice alike. There was always a difference in arrangement and illustration. It was a matter of astonishment to those who heard him scores of times to note his varying modes of treatment. To them the old theme had the freshness of novelty, and their interest was aroused in watching the growth of the subject as it developed under the influence of each new audience. He aimed to gain the attention and sympathy of the audience at the first moment of speaking; and from the day on which he made his first speech in a stiflingly hot school-room, with a seedy overcoat buttoned up to his chin to conceal his rags, to the night when, at Frankford, he uttered the now memorable "Young man, make your record clean," he almost invariably gained and kept the attention and sympathy of his auditors. The audience seemed to be mentally grasped with a steady hand. They felt immediately his mental action upon them, as he sent it out through the mysterious channel of sympathy.

His bearing towards an audience was modest, manly, respectful, with an air of genial hospitality towards welcome guests. His opening tones were firmly and deliberately enunciated in a pleasantly colloquial manner, and accompanied with little or no action. A few truths were stated with a quiet earnestness; but an illustration or an anecdote from his personal experience was not far from the close of his first ten sentences. Then began his marvelous play of dramatism. Every inch of him spoke. He



once heard a boy say to his companion, "Jimmy, did you see him go it with his feet?" His very hair was expressive. He even "talked with his coat tails." He was nothing if not dramatic. He was not Gough if he was not in action. It was a necessity with him to *keep doing*. It is doubtful if instantaneous photography could have caught him long enough in one attitude to secure his portrait. So salient was the characteristic of his method of thinking and speaking that one might accurately speak of his "dramatic-mindedness." His mind was constantly in vivid and varied action, and his mind put his body into action. His dramatic aptitude of mind spontaneously conceived a truth, an argument, an event, a scene, in some concrete embodiment that was capable of representation. An idea, under his treatment, was not adequately expressed until it was dramatized and acted out before the audience.

But the story and its action was never presented for its own sake. His action, be it understood, was *spontaneously* dramatic and never theatric. He was utterly oblivious of acting. He never calculated a single effect. His manner spontaneously expressed his nature. It was used with an oratorical, not an artistic purpose. It was used to illustrate a truth or illumine an argument. Generally it *was* the argument. His dramatizing mind did its thinking, framed its argument, urged its persuasive appeals *in and by* his anecdotes, illustrations, and descriptions. He was not dressing his thought with ornament; his language and action were thought unconsciously "*incarnated*" with all seriousness of purpose. The speaker was too sincere, too much in earnest fancifully to play with his auditors or his gifts. A novelist could write his story far more artistically than he was telling it. A skillful actor could better represent the scene in accordance with the principles of histrionic art; but neither of them could produce the effect of *reality* that he did. To them the emotional life is fiction; it is real only in the imagination; to him it was *vitally* real. They would not exert his magical spell, because they could not have the tremendous moral passion that gave to his emotional expression its sole motive power. They would not have the tremendous force of his bitter personal experience. Their method of procedure was Art: his was Nature. "Sometimes when speaking on temperance," he said, "I seem to be absolutely engaged in a battle, the enemy before me, — not as a man of straw, but the real, living horror; and in the wrestling with that, face to face, hand to hand again, — like the blind war-horse when hearing the trumpet's charge, — rush on, fearing and caring for nothing, but that I may deal heavy blows, and send the fiend away howling." Such spontaneous and self-forgetful expression of Nature and Reality is a hundredfold more powerful in its effect than is possible for the highest products of Art.

But the great speaker was keenly sensitive to the mental action of the audience upon himself. A sympathetic audience quickened all his faculties and powers into intense activity. He had the immense advantage of having the sympathy of the audience *for* him in his moving personal

history. As the speaking proceeded he drew from their varying emotional condition new and stronger inspiration and ever-growing power. Sometimes he was so thoroughly absorbed in his theme that he seemed to speak by a kind of inspiration, utterly unconscious of weariness, pain, or effort. The subject fastened itself upon him with overwhelming power. And yet, in his most exalted moments of movement and passion he never lost generalship over the forces within and without. He was always more or less nervously depressed before speaking. When very weary his dread of facing an audience amounted to great mental distress. On one occasion he went to the audience-room three times before he could sufficiently conquer his nervous timidity to enter. Sometimes an audience with peculiar ideas of propriety would dampen his enthusiasm almost to the point of failure. He once addressed an audience with his usual variety of the arts of speech. He failed to excite a smile or a tear, or a sign of approval. He left the platform greatly depressed, and convinced that he had lost his power of public speech. On his way to the reception-room he met a man with a beaming face; "Mr. Gough," said he, with many a chuckle, "when you were telling those funny stories I thought I should laugh, but I did n't. I came pretty near it three or four times but I *held in*." The discomfited speaker turned upon him almost indignantly: "Your appreciation, sir, comes too late. If you ever try that way of listening upon me again, or upon any other speaker, may your tongue cleave to the roof of your mouth." While the lecturer felt the stimulating efficacy of praise, it was not his vanity that craved the applause, but simply a desire to know through their signs of approval that he was accomplishing his object with his audience. Audiences want to be pleased, and it is but natural to manifest pleasure.

The possession of the power so to play upon men's hearts and influence their lives, and the possession of such large susceptibility of exaltation of emotional excitement in the presence of an audience, and the power of language, voice, and action adequately to communicate that excitement are usually regarded as the principal qualifications of a great orator. But it would be an error to explain the superior power of Gough over audiences by assuming in his efforts the presence of the supremest qualities of a great orator. Let us remember his own discriminating words: "I always disliked and protested against the use of the terms 'orator' and 'orations' as applied to me and my speeches. My addresses were never 'orations,' and I make no pretensions as an orator." This protest is no piece of mock humility; he was too sincere a man to be guilty of such affectation. It is not essential to define his true place among the masters of assemblies, nor are we gratuitously anxious to decide his rank. Individual conclusions, even when carefully reasoned, decide nothing. It is not that we fail in admiration for his eminent talents that we regard his self-estimate as the true one. Our agreement with his opinion carries with it no detraction. The truth is, that people are prone to forget that an orator, in the truest sense of the

word, is a great rarity. Demosthenes was the sole glory of Greece in the oratorical art; all the rest of her famous speakers were splendid rhetoricians, but not orators. High authority affirms that only in Cicero's lifetime was any great eloquence in Rome; another claims that no member of England's Parliament will be ranked among the orators whom Lord North did not see, or who did not see Lord North. We dare to add John Bright and Gladstone to England's splendid roll of oratorical worthies. We hazard but little in saying that the great era of American oratory closed with Webster. Every orator, it is true, is a public speaker, but not every public speaker is an orator. Oratory implies great subjects, like crises in the history of Church or State; it implies impressive occasions of its display; it implies amplitude and accuracy of knowledge on the part of the orator; a conquest over the cultivated wisdom of a senate as well as the power to sway the susceptible populace; an impassioned majesty of movement in the unfolding and transference of great ideas and profound sentiment that root themselves in justice, religion, or liberty; it implies a certain pomp and copiousness of diction; a rhythm, roll, and sweep of style and long sustained on steady wing; and an energy and nobleness of delivery that betoken the grand manner befitting the elaborate treatment of imperial themes. Gough knew his wonderful influence over an audience, but he appreciated the wide difference between his powers and efforts and the characteristics of classical oratory. His modest soul shrank from claiming, or permitting his enthusiastic admirers to claim for him, the splendid qualifications that would rank him with the Bossuets, the Chathams, the Mirabeaus, and the Websters of oratory. It is unreasonable to expect all things from any man; and it is no discredit to an effective speaker that he is not placed on an equal pedestal with the world's first-rate orators.

If he was not an orator, no more was he a dazzling rhetorical artist, like Burke or Canning, like Everett or Choate; he was more than an orator, a rhetorician, or a dramatic artist. His method of public speech was the orator's method — the extemporaneous, and extemporaneousness is death to Rhetoric. He was lacking in the prime essential of Rhetoric — style. Not that he was deficient in imagery or the ornamental arts of composition; but he lacked the fineness, polish, and splendor of the ripe culture that has the time and the skill patiently and *designedly* to weave into the texture of speech the elaborate forms of Beauty that satisfy cultivated taste. Was a man who had never seen a school-room as a pupil since he was a boy of ten, and who had lived to his twenty-fourth year the life of a vagrant, with seven of those years worse than lost — was such a man, when placed upon the rostrum, to vie with the consummate flower of the best university culture? The comparison is obviously unfair. Still, he had a style of his own that was the direct antithesis of the written, rhetorical style. "Style is the man," and Gough's matter, manner, and style are so inseparably interwoven with the warp and woof of his individuality that it is difficult to consider them apart.

He was a notable example of oratorical *wholeness*. His passionate moral earnestness imparted a prodigious vehemence to his voice and action. His gestures were redundant, often extremely violent, ungraceful, and sometimes grotesque. But they were strikingly significant, and consequently full of variety. He paced the stage from one end to the other. He might have been asked as a Roman orator was once asked, "How many miles have you spoken to-day?" Practically, he did not appreciate the value of the impression made by reserved power. He expressed *all* that was in him. But his vehemence was not rant, for it was the expression of genuine feeling, and powerful feeling at that. Had his speaking acquired "the temperance" that would "give it smoothness" it is safe to say that Gough would not have been Gough. He would have been shorn of his power. His vehemence was natural, spontaneous, and real; this virtue protects him from over-fastidious criticism. He was made for the platform and was made by it. So was his style. He had the courage of his individuality. He dared to be himself. He followed the law of his own nature. His instincts for public speech were strong and controlling, and he threw himself unreservedly upon them. He was an inspirational speaker. His preparation was his romantically pathetic personal experience, his varied though desultory reading, and contact with men; his training-ground was the platform during the business of speaking. There was little previous study of the special theme, no elaborate preparation. He often went upon the platform not knowing what he should say, but unwittingly followed Rousseau's advice for writing a love-letter,—begin without knowing what you are going to say, and leave off without knowing what you have said. The secret of his success was as much a mystery to him as to his hearers.

As his mind was essentially of a dramatic cast, the natural expression of his mental action was full of color, full of nerve, variety, picturesqueness, and energy. His style had nothing of the scholar's speech, but was simple and familiar. He spoke idiomatically, because he spoke naturally. His ideas were moulded in a form that gave to his mental and physical peculiarities full and free play; it fitted his thought and fitted his audience; hence it was the best style *for him*. His self-criticism in style had relation to its fitness for an audience. If word, phrase, argument, anecdote, illustration did not "fit the audience" he dropped it; and he discovered its fitness or unfitness by actual experiment upon an audience. He used style and diction for *immediate* effect. He never had an eye on posterity while speaking; consequently his literary expression has nothing to recommend it *as style*. It will not endure the test of perpetuity of admiration. In this respect he is not unlike scores of famous speakers. His imagination found expression in metaphors rather than in similes; in palpable, popular figures and illustrations drawn chiefly from personal experience and human life as he found it, addressed in delivery quite as much to the eye as to the mind, and instantly comprehended by the humblest auditor. He had a certain *springiness* of

mental method, darting from one point to another by the association of ideas rather than in an orderly procession of thoughts. His ideas turned on hinges; they were not connected by logical links. The unity that harmonized the variety in his immethodical speech was an oratorical rather than a rhetorical unity. It was a distinct vivid conception and image of the *object* he wished to accomplish in the minds of his audience, and the unifying influence of a single *personality* speaking and moving before them. After all, the average audience cares little for the niceties of speech and literary construction. In a word, then, his style was too pictorial, too salient, irregular, and anecdotal for a purely rhetorical speaker.

But to say that a speaker is not an orator or a rhetorician, or does not hold the qualities of both in perfect equilibrium, as Wendell Phillips did, is not to deny him eloquence. Every orator is presumably an eloquent man, but every eloquent man is not necessarily an orator. We come around again to the starting-point, claiming for our dead Great-Heart of Moral Reform the distinction of the most famous master in modern times of a popular, off-hand, platform eloquence, spontaneously expressing itself in dramatic form. He may not be the *beau ideal* speaker of our individual preference, or a desirable model to propose for oratorical imitation; but there is no appeal from the verdict of those best judges of true eloquence, — the People.

## BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

## THE BATTLE OF HALÛLE, 691 B. C.

HALÛLE (i. e. "hollows"), or *Halûlina*, was the name of an ancient Babylonian city on the Tigris, situated north of Babylon, in the neighborhood of Baghdâd. The Arabian geographers call it *Haulâye*, which seems to be identical with the place mentioned in Syriac texts as *Hâlê* in the district of *Râdhân*, situated between the two rivers *el-'Adheim* (Assyrian *Radâmi*, in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, ii. 4, 25 *φύκος*) and *Diylâ* (Assyrian *Turnat*, in Pliny vi. 132, *Tornadatus*). It was here that King SENNACHERIB of Assyria (705-681 B. C.), the son and successor of the conqueror of Samaria (722 B. C.) SARGON (Is. xx. 1), succeeded in completely destroying the great league of Babylonians, Elamites, and Aramean nomadic tribes brought together by the rebel SHÛZUB of Babylon.

SHÛZUB (i. e. "liberator") seems to have been a Chaldean of low origin who as a *guerilla captain* infested the swamps of South Babylonia. In an inscription of Sennacherib (from a memorial slab found at *Nebi Yunus*<sup>1</sup> during the excavations undertaken by the Turkish government, and now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople) he is called the son of GAHUL, which is apparently the Babylonian prototype of the name Zopyrus. He had been defeated by Sennacherib in the latter's fourth campaign (700 B. C.) at the city of *Bittât* in South Babylonia, so that he was forced to seek safety in flight. Immediately afterwards Sennacherib had turned upon MERODACH-BALADAN, at that time king of Babylonia, whom he had in his first campaign conquered with his Chaldean, Aramean, and Elamitic allies, at the city of *Kish* (probably the mound of ruins known as *Uheimir*) in the neighborhood of Babylon (about 14 kilometres north of *Hilla*).

This is the same Merodach-Baladan who, as related in Is. xxxix. and 2 Kings xx. 12-19 (704 B. C.), congratulated King HEZEKIAH of Judah on his convalescence, the chief aim of this embassy rather being to persuade Judah to join the coalition of Chaldea and Elam against the Assyrian supremacy. This treasonable plan was also the cause of Sennacherib's campaign against Assyria's hereditary enemy in Babylonia.

Merodach-Baladan, who after having been defeated at *Kish*, had been compelled to flee to the swamps and cane-brakes of *Guzmân* on the Persian Gulf, while Sennacherib plundered Babylon, his capital, was no more fortunate in the second campaign than in the first. He had to flee by ship across the Persian Gulf to Elam, leaving his land without a ruler. During his absence, while Sennacherib was engaged in his fifth campaign against the inaccessible mountain fastnesses on the *Nipur* range on the left bank of the upper Tigris in the highlands northwest of Assyria (699-698 B. C.), Shûzub had succeeded in making himself King of Babylonia.

<sup>1</sup> Nebi Yunus (i. e. "Prophet Jonah") and Kouyunjik (i. e. "lambkin") are the names of the two artificial mounds which rise about 20 metres above the plain on the ruins of ancient Nineveh, opposite Mosul, on the left bank of the Tigris. The official name of Nebi Yunus (situated south of Kouyunjik) is to the present day *Ninawâ*, Nineveh. In the speech of the people it is called Nebi Yunus, after a mosque erected on it and dedicated to the Prophet Jonah, originally a Chaldean Christian church.



Sennacherib, recognizing the danger, resolved to march directly against Elam, which had constantly supported the rebellious Chaldeans, and had also granted an asylum to Merodach-Baladan and his followers. Through the skill of captive ship carpenters from the country of the *Hittites* the king had large ships built in Nineveh and *Til-Barsip* (the capital of the district of *Beth-Adin*, the modern *Birejik*, on the left bank of the Euphrates, where this river begins to be navigable). These, manned with captive Tyrian, Sidonian, and Ionian sailors, he sent down the Tigris as far as *Opis*, Assyrian *Upia*, the celebrated ancient emporium at the mouth of the *Râdhân* (*el-Adheim*) in the Tigris. From there by the help of wooden rollers they were transported over land to the Canal *Arahtu* (the so-called Babylonian Nile)<sup>1</sup> and thence they passed down the Euphrates, across the Persian Gulf (which at that time, as is well known, extended farther north)<sup>2</sup> into the mouth of the *Eulaeus* River (the present *Karûn*, Daniel viii. 2, 16, *Ulai*) in Elam, on whose banks the enemy awaited them. The landing and disembarking of the troops being successfully accomplished, the enemy was defeated, and after a short and victorious campaign the invading army returned to Assyria with numerous Chaldean and Elamitic prisoners. On the return through Chaldea, Shûzub also was conquered, taken captive, placed in fetters, and carried to Assyria. The Elamitic auxiliaries who had come to his help were dispersed.

The following expedition against Elam was less successful. To be sure, Sennacherib at first pressed forward victoriously and conquered 34 Elamitic cities, so that the king of Elam, KUDUR-NAHUND, fled in affright from his capital *Madakt* to *Haidal* in the distant mountains; but then the inclemency of the weather compelled him to break off the campaign and return to Nineveh.

This mischance fanned anew the smouldering embers of Babylonian discontent into a glowing flame. All trooped behind SHÛZUB the "liberator," who had in some way escaped from his Assyrian captivity. Under the pressure of circumstances they made him king of Babylonia in spite of his antecedents; and he, in harmony with his previous life, unscrupulously plundered the temple treasures of Babylon in order to insure the help of the weak-minded<sup>3</sup> UMMA-MENAN (who had recently succeeded after the sudden death of his brother KUDUR-NAHUND to the throne of Elam) and of the Aramean nomadic tribes tenting in or about Babylonia. Also the son of MERODACH-BALADAN, NABÛ-SHUM-ISHKUN (whose father had in the mean time quite probably died in his Elamitic exile),

<sup>1</sup> Professor Friedrich Delitzsch regards the *Arahtu* as the *Gihon* of the Paradise story, and thinks that it branched off from the Euphrates at Babylon. But if the ships were transported overland on rollers to the *Arahtu* it is evident that this canal must have extended farther north. Nor would they have said otherwise of the *Arahtu* that "it supplied Babylon with life." This is another argument against the correctness of Professor Delitzsch's theory that the Garden of Eden was situated in the district of Babylon.

<sup>2</sup> Before the beginning of the passage across the Persian Gulf the king brought an offering to Ea, the lord of the deep. He threw a golden ship, a golden fish, and a golden *allûtu* into the sea. *Allûtu* seems to be the Talmudic *âlîthâ* (*îlîthâ*, *allûthâ*), the name of a fabulous animal supposed to render fire-proof or to extinguish the fire.

<sup>3</sup> Assyrian *thuppushû*, properly *ṣaxûs*, *pinguis*, talmud. *hippêsh*; cf. Psalm cxix. 70. Talbot translates *illegitimate*, Smith *foster-brother*, Hoerning *own brother*. Cf. also *Hebraica*, vol. ii. p. 142, Col. ii. 1.

joined the league. At *Halûle* the battle took place. The mighty host of the confederates was annihilated by Sennacherib. One hundred and fifty thousand of their warriors covered the battle-field. NABŪ-SHUM-ISHKUN and many Elamitic nobles fell alive into the hands of the Assyrians. SHŪZUB and UMMA-MENAN, on the other hand, succeeded in escaping. All feared that Sennacherib would undertake a new invasion of Elam. The Elamites fled to the mountains, and would not venture away from them. Sennacherib, however, determined to destroy the focus of this constant disturbance in Babylonia. This was nothing less than the ancient holy city of Babylon. He blockaded the city and stormed it in spite of Shūzub's no doubt most desperate defense. Irritated by the repeated insurrections, Sennacherib inflicted a terrible punishment. All the inhabitants, old and young, were massacred, so that the streets of the city were filled with corpses. The divine images were shattered, all the houses razed to the ground, the city walls, temples, and towers were torn down and buried in the waters of the *Arahtu* canal. "More terrible than the Deluge," says the king in an inscription engraved at three different places on the rocks of *Bavian*<sup>1</sup> (a small Kurdish village on the left bank of the *Ghazir*, about 17 kilometres northeast of *Horsabad*), which was discovered by Ross and Layard, "more terrible than the Deluge I brought about its destruction." For fully eleven years Babylon disappeared from the face of the earth. Not until Sennacherib's son and successor, ESARHADDON (681-668 B. C.), the father of Sardanapalus (668-626) succeeded to the Assyrian throne was the city rebuilt.

The Battle of *Halûle*, whose immediate result was this terrible destruction of Babylon, is, in the rock inscription of *Bavian*, but briefly mentioned. A full account, on the other hand, and, as TALBOT has already remarked, the most elaborate one that has yet been found in the Assyrian annals, is contained in the famous hexagonal clay prism, usually called the Taylor Cylinder from the name of its former possessor. This was found in the year 1830 at Nineveh, and is now deposited in the British Museum. The cuneiform text is published, though not without some errors, in vol. i. of Sir HENRY RAWLINSON's great work, "The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia," plates 37-42.

The inscription contains accounts of the first eight campaigns of the king, among which the third, undertaken in the year 701 B. C., against King HEZEKIAH of Judah, is of special interest for Old Testament History.

This invaluable historical document has been translated several times with more or less success. H. F. TALBOT gave an English translation in vol. i. of the "Records of the Past" (2d ed. London, 1875); JOACHIM MÉNANT a French one in his "Annales des rois d'Assyrie," Paris, 1874, pp. 214-225; and a pupil of Professor FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH's, Dr. REINHART HOERNING (at present assistant keeper of Oriental Manuscripts in the British Museum), a German one (along with a transcription of the original text) far surpassing the work of TALBOT and MÉNANT, but still rather inaccurate in several not unimportant details.<sup>2</sup> In addition to these

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Pinches, in the introduction to his translation of the Bavian inscription (*Records of the Past*, vol. ix. p. 22), is wrong in assuming that this expedition against Babylon is identical with the fourth on the Taylor Cylinder.

<sup>2</sup> *Das sechseitige Prisma des Sanherib*. Inaugural-Dissertation von Reinhart Hoerning. Leipzig, 1878.

we also find the original text, transcription and translation, in GEORGE SMITH's "History of Sennacherib," which, begun in 1871 and completed by Professor A. H. SAYCE in 1878, cannot be regarded as standing at the present level of Assyriological science.

The destruction of Babylon is not related on the Taylor Prism. Hence it is evident that it must have been written before this event and immediately after the victorious Battle of Halûle. According to the date at the end the document was composed on the twentieth day of the month Adar, under the eponymy of BEL-EMUR-ÂNI ("Bel has seen me"), Governor of Charchemish, i. e. 691 B. C. That the battle was still fresh in the memory of the writer, one can feel from the following account taken from the official annals, which I present here in a new translation.

Sennacherib says:—

In the eighth of my campaigns after SHÛZUB had made his escape, the inhabitants of *Babylon*, mean devils, locked the city gate; their heart again planned the making of an insurrection. (Behind) the Chaldean SHÛZUB, the cowardly bastard,<sup>1</sup> the servant of the governor of the city of *Lahir*, the fugitive deserter, the sanguinary villain,—behind his back they collected themselves, marched down to the marshes, and started a revolt.<sup>2</sup> I inclosed him with a cordon (of warriors)<sup>3</sup> and endangered his life. For fear and hunger he fled to *Elam*. But as vile infamy and disrepute followed him (even) thither he hastened (again) from *Elam* and arrived at *Shudna* (the district of *Babylon*). The Babylonians seated him upon the throne for which he (indeed) was not fit,<sup>4</sup> and intrusted him with the government of *Shumer* and *Akkad*.<sup>5</sup> They opened the treasury of the temple *Esagil* and sent the gold and silver of BEL and ZĀRBANĪT,<sup>6</sup> which they had taken out of the temples of their gods, as a bribe to UMMĀ-MENAN, the king of *Elam*, who had no intellect or common sense (saying to him): "Bring together thy army, assemble thy train, hasten to *Babylon*, meet and join us, thou art our stronghold!"

He, the Elamite, whose heart did not reflect that I in the course of my first campaign against *Elam* had conquered his cities and turned them into arable land, took the bribe from them, brought together his troops and his train, put the wheels on the chariots and wagons, harnessed the horses and mules, and called the (Elamite) districts *Parsuash*, *Anzan*, *Pashir*, *Ellip*, *Iaz'an*, *Lakabri*, *Harzun*, *Dumnuq*, *Sul'a'a*, *Sam'un*; (also) the son of MERODACH-BALADAN;

<sup>1</sup> Properly πορνικῆς ἀνδρας, the latter hyperbolically in the meaning of γυναικῶνας.

<sup>2</sup> Ménant: Suzub, l'homme *kalkak khum dun* et perfide, s'était soustrait à la domination du préfet de Lakhir. Un homme de la ville d'Aruzika, un transfuge coupable de sang versé, devint alors son complice. Il habitait sur les rives du fleuve Agammî; il méconnaissait les lois.

<sup>3</sup> Nitu (V. R. 19, 21 d). This word has been mistaken by Mr. Pinches (*Records of the Past*, vol. ix. p. 27, l. 44) for the name of a city. A Babylonian city of Nîl does not exist.

<sup>4</sup> Ménant: parce qu'il n'était pas soumis à Elam.

<sup>5</sup> Talbot translates: SUZUB the Chaldean, LIDUNNAMU a man who had no education, KILPAN Prefect of Lakhiri, a refugee from Arrapkha, and a band of wicked men around him assembled. He entered among the marshes, and made there a hiding place: then, to collect more men, he went back by himself and passed into Elam, over the bounds and frontiers; then, with the band of criminals who were with him from Elam he returned rapidly, and entered the city of Suanna. The men of Babylon, even before he wished it, upon the throne had seated him, and the crown of Leshan and Akkad had bestowed upon him.

<sup>6</sup> Zâr-banîl (i. e. "producing progeny"), whose name appears, 2 Kings 17, 30, in the corrupt form *Succoth-benoth*, was the consort of Merodach, the principal deity of Babylon.

(moreover) the (Chaldean) districts *Beth Adin*, *Beth Amukkân*, *Beth Shilân*, *Beth-Sâla-Larak*; also the city of *Lahir* (situated near the Elamitic border); as also the Aramaic nomadic tribes tenting in or near Babylonia, *Puqûd*, *Gambul*, *Halat*, *Rû'a*, *Ubûl*, *Malah*, *Rapiq*, *Hindar*, *Damun* — (all this) great league to his side. Their mass took the road to *Akkad*, and came to *Babylon*, and after they had joined *SHÛZUR*, the Chaldean, king of *Babylon*, their (united) forces formed ranks (for the march).<sup>1</sup>

Like a swarm of locusts at the beginning of the year, all at once they came upon me to give battle. The dust clouds of their feet, like a heavy storm cloud with mischief pregnant, covered the face of the vast heavens. Opposite me, at the city of *Halûle*, on the bank of the *Tigris*, they posted their battle array, made straight for me, and called on their weapons for decision.

But I to ASSUR, SIN, SHÂMASH, BEL, NEBO, NERGAL, ISHTAR of *Nineveh*, ISHTAR of *Arbela*, my (divine) helpers — to them I prayed for victory over the powerful foe; and they heard my prayer and promptly came to my succor.

Like a lion I grew furious; I put on my coat of mail (made) of the hide of a wild bull, and with my battle helmet of the same material I covered my head. My grand war-chariot which crushes the enemy I hastily ascended, in the wrath of my heart I grasped in my hand the mighty bow which ASSUR had bestowed upon me; the life-destroying arrow my clenched hand seized. Against all the warriors of the mean foe<sup>2</sup> I roared like an oppressed lion,<sup>3</sup> like the Thunder-god I raged. By command of ASSUR, the great lord, my lord, I stormed on flank and front, like the coming of a violent storm,<sup>4</sup> against the enemy. With the weapons of ASSUR, my lord, and the shock of my mighty attack, I shook their breasts. I made them retreat. With arrows and javelins I thinned the (ranks of the) hostile warriors, clearing my way with difficulty through their corpses.<sup>5</sup>

HUMBA-ÛNDASHA, the *Nagir*<sup>6</sup> of the king of *Elam*, a high officer who led his army, his Adjutant-General,<sup>7</sup> along with his magnates, whose daggers were stuck in golden belts, their wrists clasped with double bracelets of solid gold — like fat oxen bound with fetters I quickly led them away and gave them the finishing stroke.<sup>8</sup> Like lambs I cut through their necks. Their precious lives I cut off like a cord.<sup>9</sup> Like a massy cloud-burst I caused their field-badges and arms<sup>10</sup> to stream over the broad plain. The spirited steeds of my chariot swam in the mass of their blood like a river-god. My war-chariot, which runs over friend and foe,<sup>11</sup> sank to the nave in the bloody filth.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ménant: Ils arrivèrent à Bab-ilu, vers Suzub, l'homme *kalkak*. Ils le déclarèrent, dans leurs écrits, roi de Bab-ilu; ils augmentèrent son orgueil.

<sup>2</sup> Talbot: with greaves of showy workmanship I inclosed my legs.

<sup>3</sup> Talbot: in crowded confusion I crushed them together.

<sup>4</sup> Talbot: as if it were fiery darts.

<sup>5</sup> Talbot: with the revolving blades I cut to pieces: their dead bodies I rolled over in the mire.

<sup>6</sup> Talbot: an engineer. — The *Nagir* (i. e. "guide") was an officer whom the Egyptians called *Mohar*. Cf. Ebers's *Uarda*, vol. i. p. 57.

<sup>7</sup> Talbot: his great *Chain of Honor*.

<sup>8</sup> Ménant: Khumba-Undasa . . . accepta des bracelets splendides en or et des anneaux en or, il accepta des monceaux d'or brillant pour le prix de sa trahison; il les livra sans défense.

<sup>9</sup> Talbot: their highly worked decorations I tore off with derision.

<sup>10</sup> Smith: their will and resistance.

<sup>11</sup> Smith: snow and ice.

<sup>12</sup> I should like here to call attention to a passage in CARL BLEIBTREU'S famous *Dies irae, Erinnerungen eines französischen Officiers an Sedan* (Stuttgart, 1884, p. 86): Cambronne soll jene schöne Phrase: "Die Garde ergibt sich nicht, sie stirbt," nicht gesprochen haben. Der heroische Cynismus *Merde!* mit dem die Aufforderung zur Ergebung beantwortet wurde, ist auch viel zweckgemässer. In der That, . . . "Koth" scheint alles in solchen Momenten, wie der blutige Koth, mit gehacktem Blei und zuckenden Gliedern vermengt, um-

Like grass the corpses of the soldiers filled the field. I cut off their testicles,<sup>1</sup> destroyed their manhood like cucumber seed,<sup>2</sup> as trophies. I cut off their hands, I took the double bracelets of gold and shining silver from their wrists. With sharp swords I cut off their noses (?), their gold and silver girdle daggers I took from their waists.

The rest of their magnates, along with NABU-SHUM-ISHKUN, the son of MERODACH-BALADAN, who, in panic, had scattered at my attack, but who had afterwards attempted to rally the forces, my hand captured alive in the area of the battle-field. The chariots, along with their horses, whose charioteers had been killed in the shock of my mighty charge, and which, left driverless, by themselves ran hither and thither, I brought together. Until the fourth hour of the night it went on, (then finally) I stopped the slaughter.

Him, UMMA-MENAN, the king of *Elam*, with the kings of *Babylon* and the princes of *Chaldea*, who had marched out at his side, the lion-like shock of my attack threw down. Their tents they left, and to save their lives they trampled over the corpses of their warriors, straight ahead. Like a young captured dove their heart failed. With their urine they bespattered the inside of their chariots, and voided themselves of their ordure.<sup>3</sup> For their pursuit I sent chariots and horses after them. The fugitives, who for their lives had run away, wherever they found them they pierced with weapons.<sup>4</sup>

*Paul Haupt.*

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT. Four Essays. By Sir HENRY MAINE. Pp. xii., 254. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1886.

THE rapidity with which England has been moving in the direction of democracy since 1832 has set some of the best minds to thinking upon the tendencies and the possible results of this movement. The book before us is what the French would call an "interpellation" of popular government, a subjection of its claims — which the author thinks are often too easily conceded because boldly asserted — to a searching but not unfriendly criticism. While lacking the rhetorical brilliancy of the later political writings of Burke, it constantly reminds us of his method, its breadth of historical survey, its appeal from speculation to experience, its philosophic caution against generalities. For American political students it has this

herstiebt. Ein Kothmeer scheint Himmel und Erde zu verschlingen, worin die Teufel sich wälzen und die Engel ersticken. Nur eine Tugend scheint noch lebendig — denn die Tapferkeit wird bald zu wüstem Morden und thierischem Instinct — das ist ein gewisser vager Patriotismus.

<sup>1</sup> *Sapesapâti*, properly *sûka*; cf. Aristophanes, *Pax* 1318, and talmudic *sifut*. — Talbot: The heads of their soldiers, like *wikit* I salted, and into great wicker baskets I stuffed them.

<sup>2</sup> Smith: Their guards I destroyed like crowds of children.

<sup>3</sup> Talbot: In double numbers they crowded into their chariots, set off, and fled away to their own dominions.

Smith: Their wickedness tortured [them], within their chariots they abandoned their weapons.

Ménant: Ils brûlèrent dans leur chars les *sinal* et abandonnèrent leurs . . . j'ai accordé la vie à ceux qui se rendirent et acceptèrent ma domination.

<sup>4</sup> Smith: Those concealed of them who for life came out, in a suitable place they destroyed with the sword.



unique interest, that a profound and sagacious philosophic historian, while revealing to his countrymen the hollowness of many current notions of democracy, stamps with the approval of both philosophy and history the distinctive principles of American popular government.

The first essay, on the "Prospects of Popular Government," confronts our optimistic assumption of the perpetuity and universality of such government with the conclusion, drawn from a large survey of facts, that "popular government is characterized by great fragility," and that "facts do little to support the assumption that it has an indefinitely long future before it." On the contrary, it carries within itself tendencies to instability and elements of danger. What men want under the name of political liberty is not "the desolate freedom of the wild ass," but a share of political power. But in wide democracies the small fragments of political power held by individual men are swept together by the party-leader, who thereby governs the rest. Universal suffrage thus becomes the most effective of all instruments of personal power. Universal suffrage, thrown away in France after the Reign of Terror, was twice revived that the Napoleonic dynasty might be founded on it; it was introduced into Germany that the personal power of Prince Bismarck might be confirmed. It is a common opinion that democracy, a wide suffrage, is favorable to reforms, to improvements in legislation, and in the arts of life. History shows the opposite to be the fact. Beginning its reign with a spasm of destructiveness, it settles down into ultra conservatism. As governments widen their electoral basis, the tendency is toward a dead level of commonplace opinion, which they are forced to adopt as their standard of legislation and policy. The *referendum* in Switzerland, the provision by which reforms adopted by the legislature are referred for confirmation to the popular vote, a measure heralded as the "most remarkable ever attempted by a republic," has almost uniformly resulted in a popular veto. Reforms have come not from the many, but the few. "All civilization," says Rénan, "is, in its origin, aristocratic." If any one thinks that in many of the above statements the author must have forgotten or ignored the career of democracy in the United States, let him ponder this somewhat startling assertion as applied to us: "There has hardly ever before been a community in which the weak have been pushed so hopelessly to the wall, in which those who have succeeded have so uniformly been the strong, and in which, in so short a time, there has arisen so great an inequality of private fortune and domestic luxury." De Tocqueville said nearly the same thing fifty years ago.

The second essay, "The Nature of Democracy," accounts for the instability of popular government and its disappointing outcome in history, from its extreme difficulty. The modern state, with distinctively defined administrative departments, grew up under monarchical institutions. In a democracy, which is the government of a state by the many, the many simply take the place of the king. Democracy is monarchy inverted. But the functions of government remain the same. The many must preserve the national existence, secure the national greatness and dignity, and compel obedience to law. But democracies have not shown themselves capable of exercising these primary functions of government. They have not succeeded in maintaining the national existence; they have not attained national grandeur; they have been turbulent, weak, and anarchic. "The fathers of the American Republic over and over again betray their regret that the only government which it was possible for them



to establish was one which proved to have so little stability." Monarchies and oligarchies, the French monarchy, the Venetian oligarchy, attained to extreme age. Republics have died young.

Wherein consists the extreme difficulty of democratic government? Guizot had said long ago that it was the difficulty of getting broad, comprehensive, public ideas recognized by the many. Our author puts the difficulty into more concrete form by saying that, while theoretically the will of the majority is the supreme law, this will gets practical expression by the people adopting the opinion of one person, or a few persons. The plébiscite, which is the most democratic of all measures yet invented, is the most effective measure invented for the government of the many by the one or the few. Democracies have everywhere begotten corruption, the caucus, the stump, the campaign newspaper, or their equivalents, the machinery by which masses of men are brought under discipline, and by which the party-leader, the wire-puller, the adept in artful phrases, appropriate to themselves the "will of the people." "Levity of assent" is the insidious disease that taints the blood and corrupts the vitality of democracies.

It seems almost like challenging the equator or the pole-star to question whether this is an age of progress, or whether the spirit of change characteristic of the age is a healthy spirit. But this the author does in his third essay, on the "Age of Progress." We begin to suspect that they have public anniversary addresses in England "in commemoration of our glorious" something or other, and that the author has been compelled to listen to too many of them. He professes not to know what progress means in the minds of those who use the word oftenest, and when he gets a definition, it means "movement backward toward a state of primitive nature," an allusion to the social theory of Rousseau. He maintains that only a very small part of the human race will tolerate any change in their institutions, that history shows mankind to be intensely conservative. Habits, manners, even fashion are changeable only within very narrow limits. Every extension of the history of the human race strengthens the impression of its essential sameness. All this shows that the perpetual change which the age appears to demand is not in harmony with the normal forces ruling human nature, and is likely to lead to cruel disappointment or serious disaster. Enthusiasm for change is comparatively rare, extremely modern, and limited to the domain of politics. Why, being averse to change elsewhere, are men so fond of change in politics? Because politics in popular governments is an exciting game. Human nature is naturally combative, and when civilization has proscribed or limited fighting, the pent-up forces find vent in the rivalry of blue and yellow, Whig and Tory, Liberal and Conservative. The necessity for legislative activity begets competition in legislative innovation. This brings the English student to the home problem, which furnished the animus for these essays. "Neither experience nor probability affords any ground for thinking that there may be an infinity of legislative innovation at once safe and beneficent." But as the Englishman looks into the recent history of Parliament, and over the probabilities of the future of legislation, he sees in his Constitution no effectual check to this spirit of innovation so fraught with danger. Naturally, therefore, and wisely, as it cannot but seem to us, he directs his studies and calls the thoughts of his countrymen to the only existing popular government which has given any satisfactory guaranty of permanence and security, the govern-

ment of the United States, which forms the subject of the fourth and last essay.

This study of the American Constitution is as fine an example as can be found of the discriminating and reasoned admiration of a disinterested observer, as contrasted with the superficial self-adulation with which we are too familiar. Now, at length, an Englishman has written 50 pages on the American Constitution not only free from blunders, which is a marvel, but in a spirit of appreciation akin to the wisdom which originally conceived it. We thank the Englishman for a conception of our Constitution which, if not new, makes a new appeal to our admiration and gratitude. It will be new to some adulators of the Constitution that its chief and crowning merit is not that it reserves to the people their rightful and immemorial liberties, — scores of constitutions have done that, — but that by conservative safeguards, by provisions which, giving ample scope for expansion and for all real progress, hedge about with obstructions and difficulties that spirit of innovation which has been the ruin of the democracies of the past, and which threatens the stability of the only other great republic of modern history, it SECURES the blessings of liberty to ourselves AND OUR POSTERITY. The lesson to Englishmen drawn from the workings of our Constitution is all the more telling from the proofs adduced, that the democratic principles of the American government were drawn from British maxims and precedents, while the conservative provisions were elaborated out of home experience. History can be paradoxical as well as philosophy. The oldest monarchy now existing in Europe, after having furnished the principles on which the freest republic in the world is founded, receives back from the organic law of that republic lessons in conservative wisdom which she sorely needs in her headlong rush into the dangers of experimental legislation.

*M. H. Buckham.*

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

SCIENTIFIC THEISM. By FRANCIS ELLINGWOOD ABBOT, PH. D. 8vo, pp. xxiii, 219. Boston : Little, Brown and Company. 1885.

THIS is a notable book. It is notable both for what it is and for what it indicates, namely, returning health and sanity in philosophic thought. Agnosticism is but a sick man's fancy ; idealism, a dream of the understanding. Knowledge is the apprehension of reality. Here is a thinker who holds that we have real knowledge of a real world, and, though partial, yet true knowledge of its innermost reality. With the courage of his convictions he challenges every form of idealism to demonstrate its validity, or perish under his merciless criticism. All that saves any scheme of idealism is the element of realism, which, whether consistently with its premises or not, it still retains. If pure thought, without presuppositions, is competent to determine reality, it is not human thought surely, but the infinite creative thought alone, which can proceed thus. And it cannot be that God first through human intelligence, his own product, thinks his universe into being. A finite intelligence, as ours is, comes into existence within a universe already ordered by an intelligence not its own, though similar, and its function is not to create, but to discover, the objective laws of that universe. And this discovery cannot by any means be made by simple interrogation of the nature of subjective

thought, but rather of the objective thought expressed in nature and in humanity. This is in truth the method of science, and by all thinkers, of whatever school of philosophy, science must be regarded as existent and as yielding verifiable results. The scientific method is fruitful in discoveries. It transmutes the unknown into the known. In the presence of this electric light, philosophy, as it now exists, seems to shine but as a dim taper. But all truth is one. The light that is in science is the light of true philosophy. The existence of this undeniable body of knowledge may serve in this age, resplendent with its illumination, to indicate the path which philosophy must take. The sciences themselves do not, neither any one, nor all of them together, give account of their basis. They all rest upon certain presuppositions, upon the unquestioned truth of which they proceed in their interpretation of nature. Human reason, however, is not satisfied unless these presuppositions are seen and tested in its own clear light. This is, then, the problem of philosophy: What is the ultimate validation of scientific truth? Instead, therefore, of the subjective "*Cogito, ergo sum*" of Descartes, let us now take as our starting-point: The sciences exist, therefore an objective universe exists, — and seek by philosophy to determine its inner and essential reality. Kant tried the experiment of making the object conform to our cognition. That experiment was the source of German idealism. Kant, however, never questioned the truth of the physical sciences. On the contrary, it was the undeniable certainty of those sciences, as well as that of mathematics, which arrested his attention and led him to seek the grounds of that indubitable certainty. He believed that he had discovered them in the *a priori* elements of human cognition. He would reverse the common assumption that our cognition must conform to the objects of it, and determine the nature of the objects of our intelligence by the nature of our faculty of intuition. This is the "Copernican revolution" which Kant believed he had effected for modern thought. "Scientific Theism" would restore, in part at least, the earlier assumption, as the only one consistent with the existence of scientific truth. Accordingly the author will not join in the cry "Back to Kant!" but, instead, calls upon us to return, if at all, to Plato and Aristotle. Those old Greeks had the true idea of knowledge. Objectivity is the ruling element in their scheme. Objective truth, likewise, is the presupposition, and the discovery of it the achievement, of the sciences of nature. Modern science clasps hands with Greek thought on that issue. But modern philosophy, predominantly subjective, is not in accordance with the fundamental assumptions of scientific thought. To Dr. Abbot there seems to be contradiction here, and he states the issue sharply: If idealism is true, modern science, which founds upon realism, is false. And if empiricism is true, the same may be said. The author of "Scientific Theism" contends for realism as the only tenable theory. He contends that the two schools of modern philosophy, the *a posteriori* school of empiricism and the *a priori* school of criticism, have both run out at last into their common logical issue, idealism. With much sagacity he traces the error to its source in nominalism. This false doctrine was taught first by the Sophists of Greece and refuted by Socrates. Realism, accordingly, became, through Plato and Aristotle, the dominant doctrine of Greek philosophy. Reappearing near the end of the twelfth century in connection with theology and in the person of Roscellinus, nominalism again encountered realism and again was defeated. The controversy was renewed, and raged through the

whole period of scholasticism. In modern philosophy the nominalistic movement reached its culmination, according to "Scientific Theism," in the critical philosophy of Kant. The doctrine of the moderate nominalist, that universals exist only in the mind of the individual conceiving them, finds expression in the theory of the subjectivity of relations, which theory is the parent of idealism.

It is time to reverse this "Roscellino-Kantian" movement, and to secure for philosophy once more a firm basis in realism. And this our author proposes to effect by the doctrine of the "Objectivity of Relations." In setting forth his theory of a true realism Dr. Abbot contends for what he styles "Relationism." He posits "the objective reality of relations as the cosmical correlate of universal concepts in the human mind." The true object of intelligence in interpreting the universe is not things crudely taken as wholes, but things conceived as systems, and as having inner and outer relations. Each thing known is known as "a relational system." The universe as a whole is conceived as an "infinite relational system." Noumena exist, not as perceptions indeed, but as real objects of intellect; not apart from phenomena, but in them, and manifesting to "the perceptive understanding" the inner reality of the universe. In place of the doctrine of the "Critique of Pure Reason" that noumena, unknowable in themselves, serve but as limiting conceptions to restrict our thinking to the realm of phenomena, "Scientific Theism" would restore the old Greek view, which is expressed in the very name itself, namely, noumena are the known or knowable objects of intelligence, and known or knowable as real. And it is difficult to see what other possible basis there can be for any theory of knowledge, of knowledge that is such in truth, and not in name only, for knowledge is the apprehension of reality. But to apprehend noumena as real is to apprehend mind as objectively real, for noumena have no possible existence save in intelligence, and as products of intelligence. The universe is therefore to be regarded as objective intelligence. Kant in the "Critique" pictures the sphere of human cognition as "an island, inclosed by nature herself within unchangeable limits, and encompassed by a wide and stormy ocean, the region of illusion." It would accord with the principles of "Scientific Theism" to represent the realm of possible human knowledge as an illimitable continent (if the expression may be allowed, though the terms are contradictory). Upon one little corner of this immense continent science has effected a settlement, and there is nothing in the nature of the territory to constitute an insurmountable barrier to the indefinite progress of science. For the universe, being throughout intelligent, is throughout intelligible, and that, too, not only for the immanent Intelligence expressed in it, but also, as the very existence of any science of nature shows, for the finite intelligences which form a part of it. In the words of the author, "The universe *per se* is intelligible through and through, and transparent to finite thought just as far as finite thought can go. This great principle of the *Infinite Intelligibility of the Universe* is the corner-stone of Scientific Theism; and its warrant is universal human experience, purified, consolidated, and organized in the scientific method." Driven on by the logic of his thought Dr. Abbot comes at last to the position that the universe *per se* is an *Infinite Self-conscious Intelligence*, that is to say, an *Infinite Personality*. And, inasmuch as the universe, being a perfect system, must be conceived not as a mechanism but as an organism, "The Infinite Self-conscious Intellect eternally cre-

ates the Infinite Organism of Nature, — that is, the universe as subject (*natura naturans*) eternally creates the universe as object (*natura naturata*).” Or again, “The evolution of the universe as *Divine Object* is viewed as the work of the universe itself as *Divine Subject*, that is, as the *Infinite Life of God in Time and Space*.” Following the clew afforded by the conception of an organism, the author further maintains that “the life principle of the universe must be an infinite immanent power, acting everywhere and always by organic means for organic ends, and subordinating every event to its own infinite life, — in other words, it must be infinite will directed by infinite wisdom.” Still further, since every organism has its end not only to fulfill its own life but to subserve the cosmical life, so the universe as a whole has both an “*immanent*” end and an “*exient*” end. But inasmuch as there is nothing beyond the universe itself, its *exient* or outgoing end “disappears as such, but reappears as Infinite Love of itself and Infinite Love of the finite.” Its immanent end “appears as the eternal realization of the Ideal, and therefore as Infinite Holiness.” And as it manifests thus infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, or thought, feeling, and will, in their infinite fullness, and because these three constitute the essential manifestations of personality, it must be conceived as Infinite Person, Absolute Spirit, Creative Source, and Eternal Home of the derivative finite personalities which depend upon it, but are no less real than itself.”

In criticism of the above procedure, it may be said that there are elements in the result reached which are not legitimated solely by what the conception of organic existence affords, unless personality is itself an organism, and the highest and most complete expression of the idea of an organism. The true starting-point and type for the speculative idea of God is furnished not in nature, but in the human spirit. We are on this point disposed to agree with the position taken by Dr. Abbot in one of his early essays, “The Conditioned and the Unconditioned.”<sup>1</sup> “The idea of God originates not in the suggestions of outward nature, but in the depths of humanity itself. The soul cannot infer God from nature, except in virtue of what it first projects into nature.” “The idea of an all-pervading personality is the formative nucleus of the idea of God; and this idea of personality, which finds no analogue in the world of matter, can only be generated through the soul’s consciousness of self-hood.”

Moreover, while affirming strict infinity of God as the ground of the universe it does not seem necessary to predicate infinity of the universe itself considered as the objective expression of the mind of God. Reason does not require us to assert that the Infinite Intelligence has given complete expression of itself. The universe, vast as it is, may yet be finite. The creation of finite existence is not incompatible with the notion of an Infinite Creator. At every point of a universe existing in space and time Infinite Intelligence may be expressed, and yet at none exhausted. And if the universe be an organism it may grow, and, if it still may grow, it is not yet infinite. It is only when we remove from it the restrictions of time and space and evolution that we can think of the universe as infinite. But the view of the author of “Scientific Theism” does not contemplate any separation whatever of God and the universe. Each is the other; what the one is as subject, the other is as object. Just as in the proposition which expresses self-consciousness, the being which thinks is

<sup>1</sup> *N. A. Review*, Oct. 1864.



the being thought, so the world is God as thought by God, and as in the judgment, "I am conscious of myself," there is distinction affirmed and not difference, but pure identity of being, so by this theory God is identified with his universe. But this is Pantheism. The author himself anticipates the charge, and thus explains himself. "If all forms of Monism are necessarily deemed Pantheism, on the ground that Pantheism must include all systems of thought which rest on the principle of one sole substance, then Scientific Theism must be conceded to be Pantheism; for it certainly holds that the all is God, and God the all." "If, on the other hand, Pantheism is the denial of all real personality, whether finite or infinite, then, most emphatically, Scientific Theism is *not* Pantheism, but its diametrical opposite. Teleology is the very essence of purely spiritual personality; it presupposes thought, feeling, and will; it is the decisive battle-ground between the personal and impersonal conceptions of the universe." "Teleology conjoined with Monism yields the organic theory of Evolution or Scientific Theism, which includes only so much of Pantheism as is really true and has appeared in every deeply religious philosophy since the very birth of human thought."

Whatever one may think of the position in which the argument of "Scientific Theism" culminates, one cannot but be impressed with the deep insight, the clear intellect, the moral fervor of the author. Whoever has the interests of philosophy at heart will welcome this masterly attempt to effect a reconciliation between philosophy and modern science. No thorough-going idealist, to be sure, will be satisfied with a book which assails so powerfully his fundamental positions. The Hegelian, no doubt, will regard the realism here contended for as a *naïve* assumption of the very thing to be made out. But for those who have not yielded to the spell of Hegel, the author's logic will have great force.

We cannot but be thankful for this strong and well-reasoned protest against the agnosticism so current in our times, a foe which has met, in this book and in John Fiske's "The Idea of God," such unexpected and powerful opposition. The arguments of these thinkers will have all the more weight with many just because they do not fight under the banner of the church.

Henry A. P. Torrey.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

MY RELIGION. By Count LEO TOLSTOI. Translated from the French. Pp. xii, 274. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

THE unique greatness of the humanity of our Lord finds forcible illustration in the impression left by his life, by his teaching, and by his character alike, upon minds and hearts made hostile by barren creed and lifeless ritual around them, and ignorant of the historic faith in its purer phases. Narrowness and defect in the individual are, indeed, only emphasized under these conditions, but the fervor of men who have turned from broken lights to the perfect light is both interesting and instructive.

Count Tolstoi, whose great historical romance, "War and Peace," after twenty-five years of fame at home, has found its way to English readers, is a Russian whose native genius, acute in mind and intense in feeling, has found within strictly national lines unusual room for observation and growth, in city and country, in schools and camps and courts. His early years he spent in the half-refined, half-barbaric luxury of the



Russian aristocracy, — a Nihilist in belief, as he styles himself, although never a revolutionary Socialist. At length, when he stood, like Dante, "in the middle of the journey of our life," at the age of thirty-five, he passed through a spiritual change, slow and painful in process, but complete, lasting, and blessed in effect. In the volume before us he describes that change, clearly and incisively, but always with the intensity of personal conviction, sometimes with the burning words of a Luther or an Augustine.

The ethical teachings of Jesus had touched him as a child by their simplicity, and still seemed to him the substance of Christianity. But the Orthodox Church, within whose pale he belonged, made prominent the external features and the obscurer dogmas of religion. So long, however, as he found place in her doctrine for these simple precepts, his confidence in her remained; but when he saw her deny in reality, and explain by subterfuge, what he deemed the very secret of Jesus, he renounced her teaching. Then he turned to the Gospels for guidance, especially to the Sermon on the Mount. The key to the whole discourse he discovered in the single precept, "Resist not evil," and on this he dwells with a preacher's insistence and reiteration. He applies its prohibition fearlessly to all life, whether private, or social, or public, and denounces governments and judicial systems, armies and police, as opposed to its tenor. Around this precept he groups the other teachings of the sermon, and especially emphasizes and explains the five commandments which he finds in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, marked by the successive contrasts between the maxims of old and the new law of Jesus. The first and broadest of these enjoins universal peace and reconciliation; the other four are directed against the several temptations to passion, profanity, vengeance, and national hatred. Were these commands observed, evil would be banished from earth, and the ideal of human life would be realized.

Why, then, we ask, have these plain precepts been left so long in neglect? Simply from ignorance is the reply, and here we find the first touch of optimism in the writer. It is natural, he says, for each man to do what seems to him best. Our task, then, is to prove that the rule of Jesus is best; best for the individual as well as for the race; best for me, whether my neighbor follow it or not. He shows the many evils in each life that come from worldly ambition and self-seeking, and the safety and peace of the unselfish soul even in a corrupt and selfish society. The martyrs of the world are far more in number than the martyrs of the cross, and the way of Jesus is alone easy and pleasant. Every man may choose that way for himself, and the poor, even more readily than the rich, may share the five conditions of happiness, — health of body, work for hand and mind, the relations of the family, and communion, sympathetic and unrestricted, with nature and with men. Differences in creed and in metaphysical basis need keep none from following this doctrine of Jesus, and, as a law of conduct, it is equally applicable to Christian and Jew, to saint, philosopher, and skeptic.

What metaphysical basis the author himself finds beneath his ethics it is not easy to discover, and even his view of the facts in the life of Christ remains doubtful. His contempt for theology, whether of Paul or of the systems, is unsparing; his explanation of the miracle of the loaves is that of Paulus and Renan; he lays no stress on the resurrection of Christ, and speaks of an immortality of influence, like the positivist. His exegesis,

often quite minute, shows a curious blending of extreme literalism and rash conjecture. His theory of the canon is like that of Canon Cook and Scrivener, and admits an easy escape from difficult texts, on the ground of late and intentional corruptions. He would uniformly render *δόξα* doctrine, not glory; and while accusing the translators and commentators of interpreting other precepts of Jesus without exactness, he minimizes the injunction to love our enemies by making enemy not a personal, but a political, term. But it is ungracious to dwell on points like these. Count Tolstoi's genius is his own, his defects and limitations are due to his surroundings, and his book betrays strange, pathetic glimpses of church, society, and government in his native land. The writer's promised version of the Gospels we may anticipate simply as a curiosity, but his present work, which would be noteworthy in England or Germany, as it comes from Russia is a marvel of ethical insight.

*Theodore C. Pease.*

TANIS. Part I., 1883-84. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Folio, pp. viii., 60. London: Messrs. Trübner & Co. 1885.

WHERE land and water melt into each other in Lower Egypt there is the reddened top of a mound. On the one side is a swamp reeking with putrefaction. On the other is a stream half-choked with the dead buffaloes of the wretched nomads. But above are crackling potsherd and fragments of obelisks. Underneath these lies a city where stratum after stratum may yet remind us of Schliemann's Troy. It is the Tanis of the Greeks, the Zoan of the Bible. Beneath Arab Sān is Roman and Ptolemaic Tanis. Lower still is Ta'an, a capital of Egypt in the days of Rameses the Great, second only to Memphis and Thebes. But this was built on an older town, the seat of the Hyksos kings, whose shaggy sphinxes adorn the Bülak Museum. Deeper still must be found monuments of Amenemhat and Usertesen of the XIIth, if not of Merira Pepi of the VIth Dynasty.

Mr. Petrie gives us a graphic glimpse of his labors on this interesting site. His improvised house was on top of the mounds and contained half a dozen little chambers for himself, his friends, and his overseers. With a telescope he could watch the workers from his room. Of these he secured from 50 to 180 without trouble. They were eager, and under stimulus of bakhshish, faithful. "So much did they dread losing work that once dismissing the whole of the gang for half a day because they persistently came late completely cured them; I never had a man late after that." The wages paid were twelve cents a day to men, and six or eight to children. Working in families and with baskets, mostly; occasionally with pickaxes and spades, the happy band dug narrow trenches and sunk deep shafts from early February to late June, 1884. Thus was excavated the great temple. Over its flat roof "gazed with stony eyes" the Colossus of Colossi, 100 feet in height and 900 tons in weight. Mr. Petrie gives his whole second chapter to this temple and its belongings.

The book is primarily a chronicle. It recapitulates what had been done by Mariette, the prince of diggers on the soil of the "beloved land." Here Mr. Petrie's mathematical eye is of service. He observes that the Hyksos inscriptions are always in a line down the right shoulder, never on the left. This Semitic idea was un-Egyptian. He compares it

suggestively with the Hebrew offering of the right shoulder in Exodus xxix. 22; Leviticus vii. 32. He marks the exact spot where the famous bilingual Decree of Sîn, known as the Decree of Canopus, was found. A Maltese dealer had advertised it before Lepsius's visit. When Lepsius came the Levantine sat on the stone refusing to stir until paid by the German Egyptologist. Before Lepsius could export it, however, the government heard of the discovery and sent a squad of soldiers to seize it. This story, Herodotus-like, Mr. Petrie repeats as it was told him without vouching for its truth.

The photographs are a fine feature of the memoir. They are distinct as those of San Francisco. The view across the sanctuary looking north shows a confused heap of broken monuments, on one of which are the final letters of Rameses's name with the *Ta anch* "Giver of Life," clear as print. The gigantic toe and the imperious head of the same monarch occur on the same page. Less legible, but of great interest, is the tablet of Ptolemy II. of Alexandrian Library renown and Arsinoë II., his lovely but dissolute sister. They are adorning the Triad of Tanis. Nor does the photographer fail to give us a peep into the store-chamber of Pithom with its associations for sacred geography and archæology. These twenty-four pictures are alone worth the price of the volume.

In its hieroglyphs the work is less notable. It is an installment. We have twelve plates of inscriptions more or less mutilated, with a double nomenclature. Their chief worth is to beginners in Egyptology. They give us the royal names, omitting the diadem titles. "Horus, Strong Bull, Lord of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ra-User Ma Setep-En-Ra, Son of the Sun, Ramessu, Beloved of Ptah," may serve as a sample of all. In Part II. is promised an inscription of the celebrated Ethiopian prince Tirhaka — nineteen lines of which were published by De Rougé.

Mr. Petrie is the author of a classic on the Pyramids. His merits as a surveyor and statistician, there so timely, will seem to some demerits in the present work. It will be thought that Tanis I. partakes too much of the nature of a catalogue. This makes him worse for reading, to be sure, but better for reference. Champollion's earliest journey to Italy was for the sake of cataloguing the Egyptian Museum in Turin. It is of interest to Bostonians to learn that they have a silver image of the god Bes, for instance, whose swinish divinity neither the Louvre nor Bûlak possesses. Mr. Petrie's accounts of the woven patterns of an Egyptian lady's garments, on page 36, and of the unique glass zodiacs with red ochre heads emblematic of the months, on page 48, are extremely curious and instructive.

On the whole the volume is to be praised for what it marks and what it heralds. It shows England in alliance with France in a broader realm than politics. It shows America sharing in the work of resuscitating papyri and publishing hieroglyphics. The honor of being vice-president of the Egypt Exploration Fund has been well won by Rev. William C. Winslow, 429 Beacon Street, Boston. It is a shame that he should have merely distinguished names on his list and five-dollar subscriptions. Where are the men of wealth to invest through Mr. Winslow their hundreds and their thousands in this virgin mine of classic and Biblical lore? I believe Tanis I. is a pledge of larger giving and deeper study in a rewarding field. Hence came the black granite statue of Nefert which charms the sculptor. Here were once the brutal erasures of Meren Ptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, putting his name in the car-

touche of Hyksos princes. Here Set, Amen-Ra, Ra, Har-em-Khuti, Ptah, Tum, Ma furnish inexhaustible problems to the student of the religion of Abraham, of Moses, and of Christ.

*John Phelps Taylor.*

GOD'S REVELATIONS OF HIMSELF TO MEN, As successively made in the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations, and in The Messianic Kingdom. By SAMUEL J. ANDREWS, Author of "The Life of our Lord upon Earth." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886.

THIS is a dignified and learned presentation, such as might be expected from the author of "The Life of our Lord," of that theory of the final issue of things which is known as Premillennarianism. As this was the early belief of the Church, so, as is strikingly shown by the recent article of Dr. A. J. Gordon in the "Independent," it is now reviving within her limits in extraordinary force, and seems to lay a peculiarly strong hold on successful Christian workers, from Moody to Christlieb and Shaftesbury. Yet it is significant, that wherever the touch of that Church reaches, who says, "I sit a queen," the theory is dead.

This theory, however, in this book, is held in a strictness of connection with Catholic Christianity, which is by no means true of its popular presentations, and is treated with a severe development of thought which it is hard to follow, and which the writer of this notice, though he has had the privilege of reading the book in manuscript, is by no means sure that he has thoroughly grasped. But it begins with the Incarnation, as that to which, apart from the fall, the purpose of God is directed. Antecedently to this in time, though subsequently in thought, are the three-stages of the divine dealings with man before the incarnation, first as unfallen in Eden, then as fallen, before the theocracy and under the theocracy. The Hebrews were chosen that under the immediate kingship of Jehovah they might, as the head of the nations, exemplify and communicate the blessings of perfect righteousness in the natural order. Failing of this, they have been, for the present, rejected, and a new election, no longer national but individual, out of all nations, through the continued activity of the glorified Christ, an election of an essentially higher order, is now realized in the gathering of the Church. The primary principle of this is not national, or natural, but spiritual. The Church is gathered out that, as the body of Christ, she may be his instrument for all his ends. The Church is not the totality, but the first fruits, of the saved. In this view the writer concurs with one who is at the other pole of evangelical thought. Rothe likewise distinguishes the Church as the bride from the great multitude of the wedding guests.

This view wholly obviates the objection that Premillennarianism ascribes to the Jews a permanent ascendancy in the Church. The Church is here held to be withdrawn from the earth before the Messianic kingdom is set up, and with her head to take part in the government of the nations, of which it is held that the Jews, themselves under the immediate kingship of Christ, will be the medium. This is believed to be necessary in order to justify the prophetic promises to the Jews. It is held to be an injurious evaporation to explain these of the spiritual ascendancy of the gospel which begins among them.

There appears to lie at the bottom of this, in what to all except the adherents of the theory seems a bizarre and literalistic form, an appre-

hension that the ecclesiastical era of Christianity is fitted to nourish in an elect body a peculiar sublimity of heavenly-mindedness, but not to realize the manifoldness of God's thoughts in the relations of general humanity.

The author believes that the renewal of the heavens and the earth, which shall finally remove from the whole creation its bondage to imperfection, begins with the setting up of the Messianic kingdom, goes on through the millennium, and is consummated, at least as respects our system, at the last judgment, when that which is finally irreconcilable with good is purged off into its own place outside the sphere of redemption. What will ensue when the Son surrenders his mediatorial kingdom to the Father, whether all the redeemed will be lifted into equality with the first fruits, or whether gradations will continue forever, the author holds himself incompetent to determine, though inclining decidedly to the latter belief. His theology being thoroughly geocentric, he holds that the final renewal of the whole creation begins with us, and esteems it not improbable that the redeemed may be a medium of God's workings in many worlds. He rejects with well-warranted repugnance the view of the Incarnation — more Hindoo than Christian — which deems it only a transitory spectacle, from which God ultimately withdraws himself again into the depths of inaccessible Deity. God, once incarnate, makes humanity thus exalted the medium of his workings in the creation forever.

The author's treatment of the varying forms and degrees of Messianic hope in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and other pre-Christian writings of the Jews, and also of the hope of immortality, follows all the variations of these with remarkable discrimination and distinctness, and shows how a thorough recognition of the human conditions of revelation can consist with the fullest apprehension of the divinely purposed result.

The author's view of the relations of the Messianic kingdom to the present dispensation does not pretend to determine whether the present ordinances will be continued into it or the ancient revived, or both, or neither. The main purpose of the book is to emphasize, in what to the Church at large will doubtless appear too tenaciously traditional a form, first, the substantiality and all-embracing scope of redemption in the whole range of creation; and still more strenuously what so sound and central a thinker as Archbishop Trench insists upon, that the Church, till now, has been largely a success, but also largely a failure, and can only receive the full meaning of the promises in the second coming of her Lord.

Charles C. Starbuck.

---

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTERS FROM H. CLAY TRUMBULL, D. D., AND THE REV.  
EDMUND M. VITUM.

To the Editors of THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

ALTHOUGH I should never think of joining issue with a reviewer's opinion of the general merit or of the specific spirit of one of my published works, I do venture to protest, in the interests of truth, against the misrepresentations in matters of *fact* concerning my latest book, "The Blood Covenant," by its reviewer, Mr. Vitum, in the March number of

"The Andover Review." That these misrepresentations are unintentional and all unconscious I have no right to question; but none the less are they positive misrepresentations for all that.

To begin with, Mr. Vittum takes an incidental mention, in the Preface of my book, of my first meeting with "facts concerning the primitive rite of covenanting by the inter-transfusion of blood, which induced me to turn aside from my other studies in order to pursue investigations in this direction;" and, strangely enough, he declares: "This we understand to be his own [Dr. Trumbull's] definition of blood-covenanting." On this assumption, and apparently with the idea that the term "transfusion" is to be taken only in its technical surgical sense of venous or arterial transfusion, Mr. Vittum proceeds to show that the universality of *this* "inter-transfusion of blood" between covenanting parties is not proved as a primitive rite.

Now as a matter of fact my "definition" of the primitive rite, between two covenanting parties, is given in my book (p. 4), as "the inter-commingling of their blood by means of its mutual tasting or of its inter-transfusion." And this primary definition is expanded (pp. 38 f., 134, 136, 203) by the declaration, that in the estimation of primitive people, "the transference of life with all that life carries can be made by the simplest blood-anointing as surely as by blood-absorption." Moreover, I distinctly included in the scope of my definition of the primitive rite of blood-covenanting the use of *substitute* blood in lieu of personal blood (see pp. 154, 323, 334, 339 f.). *This* rite of blood-covenanting — as so defined — it is of which I have endeavored to find traces among the different peoples of the world. On my success or failure in *this* line of investigation my book ought in fairness to be examined and judged. Even where I employ the term "transfuse," its use is certainly entitled to the breadth of meaning given it by Webster: "To cause to pass from one to another; to cause to be instilled or imbibed."

A single illustration of the manner in which Mr. Vittum would discredit the sufficiency of my proofs, through his misconception of my definitions of the primitive rite itself, is perhaps as good as more. He says: —

"Before the Christian era the strongest evidence [adduced in the book] is from Herodotus, who mentions the shedding of blood in the making of covenants among the Scythians, and among the Arabians; but in neither case is there an *inter-transfusion* of blood."

Yet I cited (pp. 61-63) Herodotus as saying, that in Scythia the two covenanting parties *drink* of their commingled blood; and that in Arabia the two parties have their hands cut along the thumbs in order to secure the covenanting blood. That the hands thus jointly cut are clasped, in the customary pledge of friendship, so that the flowing blood shall inter-flow in literal *transfusion* would seem to be put beyond reasonable doubt not only by the inherent probability, but also by the subsequent description by Tacitus of Oriental covenant-making, wherein it is distinctly said that the hands of the parties are joined before the blood-drawing.

Not only the word "transfusion," but the word "proof," seems to be so employed by Mr. Vittum as to misrepresent the contents of my book. Thus, in commenting on my proofs of blood-covenanting, he says: —

"The only proof, then, that Dr. Trumbull brings forward to support his



statement that it is an 'ancient Semitic rite' is, that he has seen one Syrian who has witnessed it, that other Syrians tell him that it is done in other places, and is an observance handed down in tradition, — but whether from Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Mahomet, or Haroun al Raschid we have no means of knowing."

Now if the word "proof" is here employed as *conclusive evidence*, it matters not, I suppose, whether it be much or little, — since it is conclusive. But if "proof," as here used, includes the idea of proffered evidence, Mr. Vittum ought to know that I did proffer in evidence of the antiquity of this rite among Semites various apparent references to it in Arabic poetry and Arabic words, as also in the Hebrew; the above-mentioned description of it, in Arabia, by Herodotus, at least a thousand years prior to Muhammad, and twelve hundred prior to Haroon er-Rasheed; and again, the indications of its existence as a world-wide primitive rite, especially among peoples early allied with Semites, as in Egypt, Armenia, etc. In other words, I brought forward the fourfold proofs which are counted in the scientific world the indications of a primitive rite among an ancient race: 1. Vestiges of the rite itself in surviving local customs. 2. Traces of the rite in the language and literature of the people. 3. References to the rite in ancient history. 4. Indications of the same rite elsewhere through the world. Whether these proofs are in themselves convincing to Mr. Vittum is one thing; whether I brought them forward is another thing. It is on this latter point that I have been misrepresented by Mr. Vittum. The value of my proofs from Arabic literature has gained in appreciation by facts brought out by Professor W. Robertson Smith, in his work on "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," issued since my volume; but even as first presented they could not, in truthfulness, be ignored.

Yet again, Mr. Vittum misrepresents my book by his denial of facts which I never affirmed, and by his exclusion of proofs which are undeniable, while he claims to have indicated the fullest strength of the case presented by me. For example, he says: —

"The great difficulty is that proof is generally lacking. The author cites the wearing of phylacteries as a token of this blood-covenant; but many scholars have been of the opinion that God never desired the Jews to wear phylacteries at all."

Now that looks as if an issue were squarely joined with some claim of mine; but I did not claim, suggest, or imagine that God desired the Jews to wear phylacteries. Mr. Vittum also says: —

"Dr. Trumbull cites Wetzstein, who 'makes reference to the binding force and the profound obligation of the covenants of brotherhood, in that portion of the East [beyond the Jordan]; although he gives no description of the methods of the covenant-rite.' It is an assumption, pure and simple, to call that blood-brotherhood."

I certainly did not call it blood-brotherhood. I merely called attention to an implied allusion in Wetzstein's description to such a blood-union as would make marriage between the parties incestuous.

Proceeding in this way in his review, Mr. Vittum finally affirms as if in assurance of the thoroughness and fairness of his exhibit of the main facts of my volume: —

"We have tried to notice the strongest facts and arguments adduced by the author to show that blood-covenanting is a primitive rite, and has 'bearings on

the Scripture;' but we fail to find such facts recorded in the volume as the title-page led us to suppose existed."

Yet in his endeavor "to notice the strongest facts" adduced by me in the line of my research, Mr. Vittum does not seem to have observed my specific proofs of the existence of this rite of blood-covenanting in the Transalpine East, before the Christian era (p. 320); in the Norseland (pp. 40-43); in Burmah (pp. 313-316); in China (pp. 43 f., 154); in Madagascar (pp. 44-49); in Borneo (pp. 49-52, 323); in Australia (pp. 331, 335-337); in Tahiti (p. 337 f.); in Yucatan (p. 54 f.); and among the Pawnee Indians (p. 339 f.); these facts covering more or less of the primitive peoples of Asia, Europe, America, and the Islands of the Sea. In fact it is only concerning the rest of the world, beyond these three continents and these islands, that he seems to have found any noteworthy facts in the volume he searched; therefore he says: "Of the rite in *Africa* there can be no doubt."

Conceding that Mr. Vittum's failure to observe these prominent facts was a result of no lack of honest and earnest endeavor to find them in the pages he was turning, it is hardly to be wondered at that he should say of his former experience in another field of research:—

"The present writer [Mr. Vittum] has lived three years in Western Asia on exceptionally intimate terms with many natives, taking care to learn all he could in regard to peculiar customs, but never heard blood-covenant mentioned either by natives or by any of the many missionaries with whom he became acquainted."

H. Clay Trumbull.

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

*To the Editors of THE ANDOVER REVIEW.*

Permit me to add a few words on this subject.

We do not understand that the sentence quoted from the preface differs essentially from the definition given on page 4. We noticed the matter of substitute blood, etc., which the author himself classes under the general head of "Suggestions and Perversions of the Rite." We understand that the essential thing in the Primitive Rite is that the blood of one should enter the physical organism of the other.

In regard to the Seythians, an apology is due Dr. Trumbull. In the writer's original MSS. the statement was made to apply only to the Arabians, the Seythians being noticed separately. In copying, the phraseology was changed somewhat, and this error was overlooked. This is offered as an explanation, not as an excuse. There can be no excuse for such a misrepresentation. The writer can only acknowledge his mistake and offer his apology.

As to the next point noticed by Dr. Trumbull, we would call his attention to the fact that the paragraph from which he quotes has reference only to those eight pages of his First Lecture which follow the heading, "An Ancient Semitic Rite," and we see no reason to change our original conclusion: "We cannot deny that it is an ancient Semitic rite, neither have we evidence sufficient to justify the assertion."

We did not attempt to say what is the author's theory in regard to phylacteries; but under the heading, "The Blood Covenant and its Tokens in the Passover," more than half of the space is devoted to the subject of phylacteries. What we intended to suggest was this: If God did not command the Jews to wear phylacteries, the fact that they did wear

them is not a proof or token that God regarded the covenant with his people as a covenant of blood-brotherhood.

As to the relative importance of the facts noticed, we would refer to page 263, where we understand the author to regard as clearly established the fact that "blood-covenanting was well known in the lands of the Bible at the time of the writing of the Bible." We understand that the bearing of the Primitive Rite on the Scripture depends largely, if not wholly, upon this fact or assumption. The case of the American school-girls, cited on page 43, would not prove that blood-covenanting is well known among Americans in the present century, and so it should be very conclusive evidence that would justify us in seeing "in the Bible much that would otherwise be lost sight of." Consequently we looked at the evidence of blood-covenanting among the Semitic people and the neighboring nations. Remote savage tribes we did not regard as equally important. Africa was mentioned, not as discrediting the evidence from Borneo, but because the suggestion was made that the Africans learned the rite from Semitic people. We gave the suggestion for what it is worth. We turned aside only to notice the Dakotas, thus dissenting from the sweeping statement on page 57.

In regard to Dr. Trumbull's closing words, let us note again the fact that of all the earnest, devoted, scholarly Americans who have occupied mission fields in the Turkish Empire for years past, Dr. Trumbull does not cite one as testifying to the existence of such a thing as blood-covenanting. If the present writer had a reputation to lose, he would gladly stand or fall with that noble band of Christian scholars to whom we owe so much of our knowledge in regard to Eastern manners and customs.

We do not agree with the reviewer who says in "The Nation" of April 1: "While the judicious grieve, iconoclasts of the Ingersoll variety will be immoderately pleased. They will declare that Dr. Trumbull has furnished them with such an armory of weapons as they could not have themselves collected without an infinite deal of trouble." But we repeat that "the book is interesting and suggestive," and hope that any who may be interested in the subject will procure the work and study it for themselves.

Edmund M. Vittum.

GUILFORD, CONN.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.* Signs and Seasons. By John Burroughs, author of "Wake Robin," "Winter Sunshine," "Birds and Poets," etc., etc. 16mo, pp. 289. 1886. \$1.50;— Saint Gregory's Guest and Recent Poems. By John Greenleaf Whittier. 16mo, pp. 66. 1886. \$1.00;— American Commonwealths. California. From the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco. A Study of American Character. By Josiah Royce, Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Harvard College. 16mo, pp. xv., 513. 1886. \$1.25;— A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English. According to the Common Version. Newly Arranged, with Explanatory Notes. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., lately Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, author of "A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament," "Biblical Researches in Palestine," etc., etc. Revised edition, with foot-notes from the Revised Version of 1881, and Additional Notes by M. B. Riddle, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hartford Theological Seminary. 8vo, pp. xix., 205. 1886. \$1.50.

*Cupples, Upham & Co., Boston.* What is Theosophy? By a Fellow of the Theosophical Society. 16mo, pp. 28. 1886. 50 cents.

*Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York.* Anna Karénina. By Count Lyof N. Tolstoi. In eight parts. Translated by Nathan Haskell Dole. Royal 12mo, pp. viii., 773. \$1.75.

*Funk & Wagnalls, New York.* The People's Bible : Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D. D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London ; author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," "Springdale Abbey," etc. Vol. III. Leviticus—Numbers XXVI. 8vo, pp. vii., 355. 1886. \$1.50.

*Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.* American Diplomacy and the Furtherance of Commerce. By Eugene Schuyler, Ph. D., LL. D., Corresponding Member of the Roumanian Academy, etc., etc., etc., lately Minister of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Serbia. 8vo, pp. xiv., 469. 1886. \$2.50 ;—The Epic Songs of Russia. By Isabel Florence Hapgood. With an Introductory Note by Prof. Francis J. Child. 8vo, pp. xiii., 358. 1886. \$2.50 ;—German Psychology of To-day : The Empirical School. By Th. Ribot, Director of the Revue Philosophique. Translated from the second French edition. By James Mark Baldwin, B. A., late Fellow Princeton College. With a Preface by James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Lit. D. 8vo, pp. xv., 307. 1886. \$2.00 ;—Persia, The Land of the Imams. A Narrative of Travel and Residence 1871-1885. By James Bassett, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board. 16mo, pp. xvii., 342. 1886. \$1.50.

*Thomas Whittaker, New York.* Three Americans and Three Englishmen. Lectures read before the Students of Trinity College, Hartford. By Charles F. Johnson, A. M., Professor of English Literature, Trinity College. 16mo, pp. vii., 245. 1886. \$1.25 ;—Sermons preached in the Chapel of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. By Robert B. Fairbairn, D. D., LL. D., Warden of the College. Pp. ix., 350. 1886. \$2.00 ;—Expositions. By the Rev. Samuel Cox, D. D., author of "A Commentary on the Book of Job," "Balaam, an Exposition and a Study," etc., etc. Second Series. 8vo, pp. xii., 455. 1886. \$2.25 ;—The Great Question, and other Sermons. By William Alexander, D. D., Hon. D. C. L., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. 12mo, pp. xiv., 307. 1886. \$1.50 ;—Authorship of the Four Gospels. External Evidence. By William Marvin, ex-Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and author of "A Treatise on the Law of Wreck and Salvage." 12mo, pp. 142. 1886. 75 cents.

*Alfred E. Rose, Westfield, New York.* Thoughts for Thought Discussions of Timely Topics. By William Frederic Faber. Pp. xi., 155. 1886. \$1.00.

*Guide Printing and Publishing Company, Cincinnati.* Evidences of Christianity. Part I. Integrity of the New Testament Text. Part II. Genuineness of the New Testament Books. By J. W. McGarvey, A. M., Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. 16mo, pp. v., 186. 1886. \$1.50.

*Iverson, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., New York and Chicago.* Gray's Botanical Text-Book. (Sixth edition.) Vol. II. Physiological Botany : I. Outlines of the Histology of Phenogamous Plants. II. Vegetable Physiology. By George Lincoln Goodale, A. M., M. D., Professor of Botany in Harvard University. 8vo, pp. xx., 535. \$2.30.

*S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago.* Kant's Ethics. A Critical Exposition. By Noah Porter, President of Yale College. 16mo, pp. xv., 249. 1886. \$1.25.

*Jansen, McClurg & Co., Chicago.* Four Centuries of Silence ; or, From Malachi to Christ. By the Rev. R. A. Redford, M. A., LL. B., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London ; author of "The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief," etc. Crown 8vo, pp. vi., 258. 1885. \$1.50.

*James Gemmell, George IV. Bridge, Edinburgh.* Christ the Ruler of the Kings of the Earth. By James Johnstone, 8 Merchiston Park, Edinburgh. Pp. 49. 1886.

# The Religious Aspect of Philosophy.

A Critique of the Bases of Conduct and of Faith. By JOSIAH ROYCE, Ph. D.,  
Instructor in Philosophy in Harvard College. Crown 8vo, gilt top, \$2.00.

We have read this book carefully, and with very great interest. It is stimulating in the highest degree, not only to the thought, but also to the true religious feelings. . . . There is in it more honest thinking and more real religion than in many bushels of ordinary sermons. The most deeply important questions are treated with wonderful analytical skill, and yet in language so clear and untechnical that it is not beyond the reach of the thoughtful reader, even though he be not by vocation a philosopher. . . . In the practical application of his conclusions, the author rises into the highest plane of stirring eloquence ; an eloquence not meant for effect, but the natural outcome of elevated thought and noble feeling. . . .

In conclusion, we would heartily recommend the book to all who read for something more than amusement. We have for some time past regarded the author as one of the acutest and most independent of American thinkers. The book before us has more than confirmed our opinion. — *Overland Monthly* (San Francisco).

The work of Professor Royce is an important one. In it the author attacks one of the widest and most interesting questions for man, and his attempt to construct a system of morality and religion is made with great mental vigor, keenness, real independence, and true originality. His book is in general well written, interesting, incisive in passages, and never tiresome. In many points of detail, and also in some of his general ideas, Professor Royce seems to be in the right, and to have triumphantly defended his theory. — *Revue Philosophique* (Paris).

We shall be much disappointed if America does not discover in Dr. Royce one of her most original and characteristic thinkers and do him honor accordingly. . . . A piece of writing that Socrates would have enjoyed to the utmost. . . . We are doing but scanty justice in this dry analysis to the amplitude and vigor of Dr. Royce's argument. Indeed, we feel that we are stripping it of all that is characteristic and fascinating, of the plenitude of familiar illustration, the fearlessness of ratiocination, and the lambent play of humor which mark the book as one among a thousand. — *The American* (Philadelphia).

Worked out with a freshness and independence of mind which make it original in the best sense. Dr. Royce gets at his own results in his own way, and this gives his book a real interest and stimulus. His manner has merits corresponding : he writes a vigorous and clear style, quite unencumbered with technicalities ; but its most striking quality is its imaginativeness. — *Mind* (London).

The enthusiasm of the utterance, the fineness of the thought, the loftiness of the morality, as well as the idealistic point of view, all remind us of the popular works of Fichte. . . . In the philosophical discussion, we find a brilliancy and a boldness which charm us. . . . A work which is worthy of the most careful study. — *Christian Register* (Boston).

Even if you disagree with him, you will rise from his book inspired to further study of the problem he discusses so ably. One thing is certain, Dr. Royce is an honest, sincere, fearless searcher after the truth, as nearly without prejudice or bias as it is possible for any one to be. — *Boston Transcript*.

Not many books have thus far been produced, in this country at least, so suggestive, so stimulating, so scholarly. — *Unity* (Chicago).

---

\*.\* For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

4 PARK STREET, BOSTON ; 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK.



## TWO IMPORTANT WORKS.

### History of the Papacy during the Reformation.

By M. CREIGHTON, M. A., Vicar of Embleton, Northumberland, late Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. The Great Schism — the Council of Constance, 1378-1418. Vol. II. The Council of Basel — The Papal Restoration, 1418-1464. \$10.00.

The story of the Reformation has been often and fully told, but the history of the Papacy during that most eventful period is much less known, and Mr. Creighton's work admirably supplies the desired information.

*From the English Churchman.*

This history includes a whole series of the most exciting events of the wonderful period which preceded the definite break of the northern nations from the Roman obedience. After two admirable introductory chapters upon the historical evolution of the Papal power and the transference of the Papal Curia from Rome to Avignon, he treats exhaustively and in minute detail of the great Papal schism which precipitated the calling of the long-denied General Councils, the religious movement in England which originated with the noble Wyclif, the interference of the French kings in the internal politics of Italy, the endeavor of the French to possess themselves of the Roman Pontificate, the rivalries of the Popes and Anti-Popes, the Council of Pisa, the religious movement in Bohemia which found its centre and leader in John Huss, the Great Council of Constance, the Council of Basel, the Hussite wars, the Council of Ferrara and Florence with the so-called reunion of the Greeks, the fall of Constantinople, and the brilliant pontificates of Nicholas V. and Pius II. . . . His work is in all respects a great one, and is certain of a permanent place on the shelves of the student of ecclesiastical history. It is a grand specimen of conscientious workmanship, written in an admirable spirit, and a credit to English historical scholarship.

### Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.

By T. MOZLEY, formerly Fellow of Oriel. 2 vols. crown 8vo, \$3.00.

Many before now — Oakley, Froude, Kennard, not to mention Newman himself — have contributed to the story of the Tractarian Movement. None of these, not even the famous *Apologia*, will compare with the volumes now before us in respect to minute fullness, close personal observation, and characteristic touches. Even to the general reader, who knows nothing and cares nothing for the merits of the Oxford Movement, these *Reminiscences*, in their vivid power and eminent candor, must possess a great charm. To the few survivors of the tragic *mêlée*, who knew the actors or had a personal stake in the issue, they are fascinating. Mr. Mozley can recall minds and characters by the score, and acquaintances long passed from the scene, and present them with a life and reality which is a sufficient guarantee of faithfulness. — PROF. PATTISON in the *London Academy*.

Every page of these *Reminiscences* is delightful. The book must be read by everybody who would understand the age. We have a sketch or a portrait of nearly everybody whose name has become known to us in connection with the Oxford Movement, with countless anecdotes, all giving life to characters that we so often regard almost as abstractions, or principles, or books. — *American Literary Churchman*.

Mr. Mozley's book is in great measure a gallery of portraits, vividly and even brilliantly sketched, of the remarkable body of men who were connected with Oriel College for about half a century of its most famous period. . . . The book is a succession of short chapters, — most of them depicting the appearance, the habits, the capacities, and characters of men who for two generations have played a leading part in English thought and life. Nothing but intimate daily association could have enabled even a genius like that of Mr. Mozley to hit them off with such distinctness and accuracy. . . . As we read his pages we live in the Oxford and the Oriel of his day. — *Quarterly Review* (London).

\*.\* For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.



# English and Foreign Philosophical Library.

*Comprising works of sterling value by eminent English and Continental scholars. Published in uniform octavo volumes, cloth, gilt top.*

**N. B.** A few copies of the following volumes can be supplied, but those who wish any of them should lose no time in ordering.

**A History of Materialism.** By F. A. LANGE. In three volumes, each \$3.50; complete work, \$10.50.

A classic in the philosophic literature of Germany. . . . It takes in the whole development of philosophical opinion, but with especial reference to materialism. — *Pall Mall Gazette*.

**Outlines of the History of Religion to the Spread of the Universal Religions.** By C. P. TIELE, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leiden. Translated from the Dutch by J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M. A. \$2.50.

A remarkably interesting volume. . . . We see how all religions, even those of highly civilized nations, have grown up from the same simple germs, and we also learn the causes why these germs have in some cases attained such a rich and admirable development, and in others have scarcely grown at all. — *Boston Transcript*.

**The Dhammapada.** Translated from the Chinese, by Rev. SAMUEL BEAL. \$2.50.

A most important addition to our knowledge. — *The Athenæum* (London).

**Color Sense: Its Origin and Development.** By GRANT ALLEN. \$3.50.

Mr. Allen's wide information and rare descriptive power will attract readers of taste and refinement; his pictures of natural life glow with animation and beauty; while his rich collection of facts forms a valuable addition to our knowledge of the external universe. — *New York Tribune*.

**Selections from the Koran.** By STANLEY LANE POOLE. \$3.50.

To the excellent selections from the Koran Mr. Poole prefixes a sketch of the early Arabs, the salient points of Islam, and the history of the Koran.

**Chinese Buddhism.** By JOSEPH EDKINS. \$4.50.

Dr. Edkins is a master of his subject; and readers who wish to see the religions of the Chinese — Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism — treated in a tolerant and comprehensive manner, will find much to interest them in these pages. Dr. Edkins gives the results of his labors in a field of research in which he has been laboring for years, and he has the art, unlike some distinguished savants, of imparting what he knows in a perspicuous and agreeable style. — *Pall Mall Gazette*.

**Contributions to the History of the Development of the Human Race.**

By LAZARUS GEIGER. Translated from the German. \$2.50.

**Edgar Quinet: His Early Life and Writings.** By RICHARD HEATH. \$4.50.

**The Essence of Christianity.** By LUDWIG FEUERBACH. Translated from the Second German Edition by MARIAN EVANS (George Eliot). \$3.00.

**The Mind of Mencius; or, Political Economy Founded upon Moral Philosophy.** A Systematic Digest of Doctrines of the Chinese Philosopher, Mencius, classified and translated with explanatory notes by Rev. ERNST FABER. Translated from the German, with additional notes, by Rev. A. B. HUTCHINSON, Hong Kong. \$3.50.

**History of the Egyptian Religion.** By Dr. C. P. TIELE. Translated from the Dutch, with the coöperation of the author, by JAMES BALLINGAL. \$3.00.

**Philosophy and Religion in Germany.** By HEINRICH HEINE. Translated from the German by JOHN SNODGRASS. \$3.00.

**A Comprehensive Commentary on the Qurân: Comprising Sale's Translation and Preliminary Discourse, with additional Notes and Emendations. Together with a complete Index to the Text, Preliminary Discourse, and Notes.** By the Rev. E. M. WHERRY. Vol. I. \$4.50.

**Linguistic Essays.** By CARL ABEL. \$4.00.

**Bhagavad-Gita.** Translated with Introduction and Notes by JOHN DAVIES. \$3.50.

\*.\* For sale by Booksellers. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

# HISTORY OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By EDUARD (WILHELM EUGEN) REUSS,

Professor Ordinarius in the Evangelical Theological Faculty of the Emperor William's University,  
Strassburg, Germany.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH REVISED AND ENLARGED GERMAN EDITION,  
WITH NUMEROUS BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ADDITIONS,

BY

EDWARD L. HOUGHTON, A. M.

*In two volumes, 8vo, \$5.00.*

This translation of a work which has become a standard in Germany, treats, with the thoroughness characteristic of the great German scholars, of (I.) The Origin and Development of a Sacred Literature of the New Testament; (II.) Collection of Sacred Books of the Christians into a whole for use in the Churches; (III.) Preservation of their original form; (IV.) Dissemination of the collection among Christian peoples; (V.) Use made of them in Theology.

The work of Professor Reuss, by its historic method, its comprehensiveness, and the help its copious references give a student for the prosecution of his researches, places itself in the very front rank of so-called "Introductions." The translation of it, with the added bibliographical references, especially to works written in English, and the enlarged index, constitutes one of the most valuable recent publications in biblical literature. A generation of students will thank you for it. — Prof. J. HENRY THAYER, *Cambridge*.

The substantial value of the work is very great. It has not been accessible to American scholars for the lack of a good and cheap translation. This has now been furnished. . . . In its present form it is to be accepted as one of the most important aids to the study of the New Testament of the last decade. — *Christian Advocate* (New York).

While each [of the departments of the volume] has real and large value, the last especially commends itself as . . . richly reviewing a very important and not largely cultivated field of knowledge, of the greatest value to the student of sacred truth. We hope Mr. Houghton may reap a satisfying reward for the excellent service here done by him to the cause of sacred letters. These volumes should be where every scholar can consult them. — *The Congregationalist* (Boston).

In respect to this work it may fairly be said that what learning, ability, skillful arrangement of the material, and a good digesting of the whole matter can accomplish on so vast a field has been accomplished by Dr. Reuss in these volumes. — Pres. O. CONE, D. D., *Buchtel College, Akron*.

An uncounted store of the most valuable, because available learning touching the subjects considered. . . . As a thoroughly learned, fair (as seen from the author's point of view), and eminently able handling of these subjects, we know of nothing better. . . . It may be cordially recommended to any one who may be seeking to master its subjects. The translation here given deserves the most emphatic approval. — *Methodist Review* (New York).

Mr. Houghton has given us a correct and readable translation of one of the most important and valuable of the recent works on the origin, composition, and authorship of the New Testament writings; for this character must be accorded to Reuss's work. — Prof. GEORGE P. FISHER, *New Haven*.

The two volumes of Mr. Houghton's translation of Professor Reuss's great work constitute a most valuable addition to the small number of truly scientific discussions of their subject in our language. — *Unitarian Review* (Boston).

An exhaustive and valuable treatise. — *The Churchman* (New York).

\*.\* For sale by all booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

ly,

y,  
of  
-  
e  
-  
n

-  
k  
-  
a  
-

s  
s  
p



# Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek.

By EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D.

New and Revised Edition, by M. B. RIDDLE, Professor in the Hartford Theological Seminary. 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.00.

Dr. Robinson's Greek Harmony has for many years held the first rank among works of its class. But the discovery of new manuscripts, and the critical labors of Greek scholars, have resulted in numerous more or less important corrections and changes which it was highly desirable should be incorporated in this work. Professor Riddle, who is easily one of the foremost American scholars in Greek, especially the Greek of the New Testament, has made a very careful and thorough revision of Dr. Robinson's Greek Harmony, producing a work of inestimable value to clergymen and theological students.

The distinctive advantages of this edition are :—

1. A better Greek text, enabling the student to form an adequate idea of the minute resemblances and divergences of the Gospels.
2. A carefully sifted list of authorities for readings where there is a difference of opinion among recent editors. This advantage is great : (a) in relieving the student of the mass of secondary authorities ; (b) in ignoring, as scholars must now do, the poorly-supported readings of the so-called received text ; (c) in giving an idea of the correctness of the readings accepted in the Revised Version. Thus the student of the New Testament has a valuable assistant in actual training of his judgment upon questions of textual criticism. No English work can be as useful to the beginner in textual criticism, and the more mature student has a careful collation of readings and authorities before his eye. Only a trained student can appreciate this advantage.
3. The Additional Notes in the Appendix present the result of more recent studies than those of Dr. Robinson. The questions are approached in a spirit, and are handled in a manner, not out of accord with those of the distinguished author.

---

# Harmony of the Four Gospels in English.

By EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D.

*Revised Edition*, with Additional Notes, by M. B. RIDDLE, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hartford Theological Seminary. 1 vol. 8vo. [*Nearly Ready.*]

This Harmony retains the Authorized Version, but gives in foot-notes the correct readings and renderings of the Revised Version, so far as questions of harmony are concerned. The full Appendix virtually reproduces the additions and alterations in the Appendix to the new edition of the Greek Harmony, which have been pronounced exceedingly valuable by competent critics. Professor Riddle has aimed to make his Notes as clear and untechnical as possible, so that they may be helpful to persons who are not familiar with the Greek.

Dr. Robinson's Harmony has long been the standard. It is now brought up to date by Professor Riddle, who has added to it the results of recent scholarship.

---

\*.\* For sale by all Booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.

# F. M. HOLMES FURNITURE CO.

MANUFACTURERS OF

## FIRST-CLASS

Study, Office, and House

## FURNITURE

OF ALL KINDS.



Price \$50 to \$100.

{ Holmes Roll-Top Desk.  
Best Desk  
ever made.

LEVI S. GOULD.



{ Holmes Reclining Chair.  
Universally  
Popular.

FRANK A. PATCH.

116 TREMONT STREET (Studio Building),  
BOSTON.

\$23 for Chair. \$5 for Book-Rest.

*THE BEST PARALLEL BIBLE.*

## The Riverside PARALLEL BIBLE,

Containing the Authorized Version and the Revised Version in parallel columns. It comprises both the Old and the New Testaments, and is printed from large bourgeois type, two sizes larger than the type of the English Parallel Bibles.

The references in both Versions are given at the foot of the page.

The book contains about 1800 pages, quarto in form, and bound in such a way as to be at once perfectly flexible and firm.

It is printed in the most careful manner at the Riverside Press, and on account of its large type is the most desirable edition of the Complete Parallel Bible.

This Bible is admirably adapted for Pulpits, Clergymen, Sunday-School Superintendents and Teachers, and Families.

### STYLES AND PRICES.

This Bible is bound in three styles, — Cloth, Persian, and Full Morocco; and the prices are respectively \$6.00, \$12.00, and \$18.00.

It can be procured of Booksellers, or will be forwarded free of cost for transportation on receipt of price by the Publishers.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

4 PARK STREET, BOSTON, MASS.